DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 468 CE 026 767

TITLE	Legislative and Programmatic Trends in Adult Education. Task 1 Report.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.
PUB DATE	2 Jul 79
CONTRACT	300-78-0469
NOTE	78p.: Small type in tables will not reproduce well. For related documents see CE 026 768-769.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Education; *Adult Programs; Community Programs; Educational Legislation; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; *Grants; Local Government; Program Descriptions; School Districts; School District Spending; State Aid; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Adult Education Act Grants to States Program; Adult Education Amendments 1978

ABSTRACT

This report provides as complete a description as available data permit of the nature and operations of the Adult Education Act Grant Program. It is divided into three major chapters. The first presents programmatic background information and a legislative history of the Adult Education Program providing funds to state and local projects. Chapter 2 contains a description of state and local programs based on statistical reports, state plans, and other available material. Specific topics include types and amounts of federal grants, state and local funding, organization and staffing, number and type of local projects, and instructional locations and participants. The third chapter contains a summary discussion of selected issues in adult education which have particular bearing on the Grants to States Program. They are divided into (1) issues of participants and participation (target population definitions, special populations and needs, participation trends, program outreach) and (2) issues of instruction (specialized needs of adults and teacher preparation, teacher certification, competency-based instructional design). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193468

TASK 1 REPORT

"LEGISLATIVE AND PROGRAMMATIC TRENDS IN ADULT EDUCATION"

Submitted to:

Office of Evaluation and Dissemination/USOE
Under Contract No. HEW 300-78-0469

Submitted by:

Development Associates, Inc.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

July 2, 1979

CE026 767

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1 - PROGRAMMATIC BACKGROUND	2
A. Legislative History	3
B. The 1978 Legislation	8
C. Initial Implementation of the 1978 Amendments	14
CHAPTER 2 - DESCRIPTION OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS	19
A. Types and Amounts of Federal Grants	21
B. State and Local Funding	28
C. Organization and Staffing	28
D. Number and Type of Local Projects	37
E. Instructional Locations and Participants	39
F. Summary and Conclusion	46
CHAPTER 3 - SELECTED ISSUES IN ADULT EDUCATION	48
A. Issues of Participants and Participation	48
1. Target Population Definitions	49
2. Special Populations and Needs	50
3. Participation Trends	51
4. Program Outreach	53
5. Some Implications and Conclusions	55
B. Issues of Instruction	57
1. Specialized Needs of Adults and Teacher Preparation	58
2. Teacher Certification	61
3. Competency-Based Instructional Design	62
4. Some Implications and Conclusions	66
C. Summary and Conclusions	67
CHAPTER 3: Footnotes	69

INTRODUCTION

More than 51 million adults in this country have neither a high school diploma nor a high school equivalency certificate. Nearly 30 percent of these, 15 million, have less than eight years of education. The results of a recent four-year study of the "functional competency" level of American adults indicated that: "Overall, approximately one-fifth of the U.S. adults are 'functionally incompetent'."

To meet the needs of these adults, the Division of Adult Education in the U.S. Office of Education is responsible for the support and operations of adult education programs through grants to the states and territories. Through the Grants to States Program of the Adult Education Act, in 1979, over 90 million federal dollars will be combined with state and local funds in order to support over 2,400 local projects, serving approximately 1.6 million adults.

Although much information on the nature and operations of the adult education program exists, it is widely scattered and some is quite difficult to find. Indeed, much basic descriptive data on local program operations does not exist on a national level in any coherent form. In an effort to increase the amount and quality of state and local level program information, a national assessment of the operation of the Adult Education Act State Grant Program is currently underway. The purposes of that study are: (a) to provide an analytic description of the Grants to States program, with particular emphasis on program participants, and (b) to identify a set of impact measures that can be studied in a longitudinal design.

In designing the national assessment, a systematic review was made of state plans, evaluation reports, annual performance and financial reports, and over 300 documents gathered during a thorough review of salient literature. Utilizing the results of that review, the purpose of this report is to provide as complete a description as available data permit of the nature and operations of the State Grant Program. In addition to descriptive information, the report also contains a discussion of several issues which are important in the operation of the program. Pulling much of the existing information together in one place should be of service to USOE in the management of the Adult Education Program and in designing a future impact evaluation.

For ease of exposition, the report is divided into three major chapters. The first presents programmatic background information and a legislative history of the Adult Education Program. The second chapter contains a description of state and local programs based on statistical reports, state plans and other available material. The third chapter contains a summary discussion of selected issues in adult education which have particular bearing on the Grants to States Program.

CHAPTER 1

PROGRAMMATIC BACKGROUND

As with any public endeavor, the Adult Education Act's Grants to States Program cannot be fully understood apart from its legislative and bureaucratic setting. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of that framework as a background for the descriptive materials and discussions of issues which follow. The information presented is based on a variety of sources, including all past legislation, the most recent Congressional testimonies, analyses of federal level operations, and discussions with many persons who have been involved in shaping both the laws and their implementation. An overview of the legislative development of the program is presented as Exhibit 1 on the following two pages.

A. Legislative History

The realization in the early 1960's that a substantial number of poor, unskilled and uneducated adults were largely unaffected by existing social legislation, prompted a series of unsuccessful efforts to fill that void. Finally, under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the educational and training needs of adults lacking basic skills in reading and writing were addressed. Title II-B of this Act established the Adult Basic Education (ABE) program to address these needs. It was assumed that, in the long run, this would raise the education level of the disadvantaged, increase their opportunities to take advantage of occupational training, and make them more economically self-sufficient.

The Economic Opportunity Act delegated the responsibilities and funding of the Adult Education Grants to States Program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Using HEW's already developed system for disbursing monies through state grants, the program was mandated to assist State Educational Agencies (SEA's) in establishing pilot projects in Local Education Agencies (LEA's):

- To demonstrate, test, or develop special materials or methods of instruction;
- To stimulate the development of LEA programs of instruction; and
- To acquire information concerning the material or methods needed for an effective program for raising adult basic educational skills.

State grants were also intended to cover the cost of LEA programs of instruction for adults and to develop or improve technical or supervisory services by SEA's.

The federal grant application process was the vehicle for disbursing the monies allocated for Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs. In addition to submitting the grant application forms, complete with budgetary justification, each state was required, by law, to submit a 12-month plan which provided for:

- The Administration of the program by the SEA;
- Submission of reports to the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity regarding the adult program; and
- Cooperative arrangements between the state education agency and the state health authority to supply health information and services for participants in the program.

Federal funds appropriated for the ABE program were designed for each state and the outlying territories on the basis of an allotment formula. Two percent of the funds were set aside automatically for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The remainder was to be distributed to the states on the basis of the relative number of persons 18 years old or older in each state who had completed no more than five grades of school or its equivalent. No state could receive less than $50,000 and each state's allotment could be proportionally reduced to reach this $50,000 base.

As part of this initial legislation, the federal share for the adult education program was set at 90 percent for fiscal year 1966 and 50 percent for fiscal year 1967. The 1965 amendments of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 89-254) expanded the ABE program to include teacher training, funded by up to five percent of the appropriations and extended the 90 percent federal share to fiscal year 1967.

Under the 1966 Title III amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Adult Basic Education program was established under its own legislation and formalized as an integral program in the U.S. Office of Education (USOE). The purpose and scope of the legislation was also broadened by stipulating that the ABE program was to "...encourage and expand basic educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment and to become more productive and responsible citizens." The 1966 legislation also provided SEA's the authorization to make grants to both public and private non-profit agencies for funding special projects, teacher training, and research.

In addition, the federal share was maintained at 90 percent for FY67 and FY68. The Commissioner of Education was also authorized to use not less than ten percent nor more than 20 percent of

appropriated funds for special projects or teacher training and for grants directly to LEA's or other public and private non-profit agencies (thus, effectively by-passing the SEA's).

The legislation also altered some of the state plan requirements. In essence, these changes reflected a new direction for the ABE program in that state plans were required to provide for cooperative arrangements to include community action programs, work experience programs, VISTA, work study, and other anti-poverty programs. It was a natural step in the program's ascent from a developmental program to one which now was being mandated to establish and expand Adult Basic Education programs.

The 1968 legislative season brought some important modifications to the program. Recognizing the need for adult education, the 1968 educational amendments doubled the minimum allocation for each state from $50,000 to $100,000, and permanently established the federal share of program expenditures at 90 percent for each state and 100 percent for the Trust Territories.

Later that year, the Adult Education Act was amended again, through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576). In order to serve out-of-school youth, the age limit for adults eligible to participate in the program was reduced from 18 to 16 years of age. This has had the effect of increasing the number of high school age youth in the adult education program.

In 1970, the amendments focused once more on the purpose of the legislation and further broadened the program. Responding to requests from participants and program staff, the purpose and scope of the ABE program was revised to permit support of programs enabling eligible adults to continue their education to at least the completion of secondary school. This, it was argued, would better equip participants for employment and other demands.

Consistent with this change, the minimum amount provided for each state increased from $100,000 to $150,000 and the allotment formula was revised so that the distribution of federal funds was now based on the number of adults not having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education or its equivalent and not currently required to be enrolled in schools. States were required to give special emphasis to adult basic education programs in the state plans, except where such needs could be shown to have been met. Also, five percent of the amounts appropriated were authorized to pay the cost of administration and development of state plans and other mandated activities.

In addition, the 1970 amendments revamped the National Advisory Committee, which had been established under the original legislation in 1966, by renaming it the National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE), and expanding its membership from seven to 15 Presidentially-appointed members. Also, the Commissioner of Education was replaced as its chairperson by a person elected by the members from among the appointees. The duties and responsibilities of the Council, however, remained the same.

In 1972 and 1973, the program's legislative mandate was expanded further. To improve educational opportunities for adult Indians, the 1972 amendments authorized grants to state and local educational agencies and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations to support planning and demonstration of projects for Native Americans. The following year emphasis was given to the elderly. As part of the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973 (P.L. 93-29), grants were authorized for the purpose of providing adult education programs for elderly persons whose ability to speak and read the English language was limited and who lived in an area with a culture different from their own.

Although the purpose and scope of the program was not directly revised by the next set of amendments, the legislation passed in 1974 included several important elements intended to improve the program. State plans, for example, were required:

- To provide for cooperation with manpower development and training programs, occupational education programs, reading improvement programs, and others;
- To assure that the program maintained its original emphasis on adults with basic education needs and that no more than 20 percent of each state's allotment of federal funds be used for high school equivalency programs;
- To provide assurance of substantial progress in providing adult education services to institutionalized persons but also to assure that no more than 20 percent of federal funds be used for this purpose in any fiscal year; and
- To provide for special assistance to the needs of persons of limited English-speaking ability by providing bilingual adult education programs.

The 1974 amendments also provided that 15 percent of a state's grant be used for special projects and for training teachers. Special projects for persons of limited English-speaking ability were added to this section under these amendments. In conjunction with this emphasis, the amendments also provided for adults of limited English-speaking ability to be members of the NACAE.

Finally, the 1974 amendments added two new program elements: a clearinghouse on adult education, and state advisory councils. The clearinghouse was limited to collection and dissemination of adult education materials and information. The councils, which were not mandatory, were to advise the state education agency on the development and administration of the state plan, and on long-range planning and evaluation, and to prepare annual reports to both the SEA and the NACAE.

Amendments made to the legislation in 1976 were essentially technical and pertained largely to state allotments and maintenance of effort requirements. For example, the 15 percent of a state's grant set aside for special projects and teacher training was reduced to ten percent. Also, the Commissioner was required to make maintenance of effort determinations on the basis of the "fiscal effort per student" or "the amount available for expenditure by states from non-federal sources". Neither is to be less than during the previous fiscal year.

Also in 1976, under the Indochina Refugee Children Assistance Act (P.L. 94-405), Congress added a new section to the Adult Education Act. This gave the Commissioner of Education authority to make grants to SEA's and LEA's for the purpose of operating special adult education programs for Indochinese refugees.

The Education Amendments of 1977 (P.L. 95-112) extended the Adult Education Act for one year while legislative hearings were held to assess the intentions and actual interpretation of the existing legislation. Hearings of the 1978 educational amendments were held in the House of Representatives on July 12, 1977 and in the Senate between October 4, 1977 and November 4, 1977. The legislative process during the subsequent 12 months was one of conference committees and Congressional staff meetings that shaped the law as it was finally enacted on October 31, 1978.

B. The 1978 Legislation

The legislation of 1978 has been described as a mandate for expansion -- not a call for reform. These amendments expanded the definition of persons eligible for program services and modified state planning requirements. The most significant changes are:

- Prior to 1978, program services were directed toward persons who did not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education and who had not achieved an equivalent level of education. The new legislation permits serving persons with a secondary education graduation certificate if they lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills to function effectively in society;
- State plans must be submitted on a three-year basis and must indicate how representatives of organizations and the target population participated in their development and will participate in their implementation;
- The learning and developmental needs of adults in all segments of the target population must be identified and assessed, including those in rural areas, urban areas with high rates of unemployment, and designated special populations;

- State Education Agencies must expand their delivery systems to include grants to non-public schools;
- Outreach systems must be expanded in order to reach all segments of the adult population; and
- Adult Education program proposals and plans must describe the efforts to provide for:
  - day care of children of program participants, and
  - transportation to and from the instructional settings.

Many factors influenced these important changes in the legislation. Among them were several federally-funded policy studies, testimony by key federal officials at Congressional hearings, and the work of NAPCAE and the National Advisory Council both before and during the legislative period.

Early in the legislative process, in April 1977, the NAPCAE Legislative Committee held a three-day seminar which was attended by a cross-section of adult educators from throughout the country. The seminar participants came up with 12 tentative recommendations which were then sent to other members of NAPCAE. In testimony before the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Dr. Curtis Ulmer reported that "hundreds" of these surveys were received from NAPCAE members. The responses of NAPCAE members to the 12 legislative recommendations are shown in Exhibit 2.1/

Concurrently, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education decided to strongly support the extension of the Act. The Council's decision was reached as a result of nine regional legislative hearings. These hearings were held in various regions throughout the country and involved over 225 persons addressing the issue of the future of adult education and amendments to the Federal Adult Education Act. In addition to these nine hearings, each council member had met with adult education students in a client review process to determine needed changes in the Act. Also, in each Council meeting since August of 1976, the Council had devoted significant time toward recommendations for amending the Act.

On May 22-24, 1977, the Council called together a selected group of previous participants from the regional legislative review meetings and discussed the issues raised in each section of the

---

1/ Dr. Curtis Ulmer, President of NAPCAE in testimony before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 95th Congress, 1st Session on H.R. 15, July 12, 1977, pp. 51-54.

EXHIBIT 2

RESULTS OF NAPCAE LEGISLATIVE SEMINAR*
(Held April, 1977)

% of Respondents (n = "several hundred")			
Agree	Disagree	Uncertain	
95.6	1.3	3.1	1. The AE Act is basically a sound piece of legislation which should be amended and extended.
72.9	16.7	10.4	2. Special emphasis in future legislation should continue to be placed on adult basic education, with a majority of funds being spent for ABE or Grades 1-8.
71.7	21.1	7.2	3. Remove requirement that State will make available not to exceed 20% of State's allotment for equivalency programs. Should be left to the discretion of each State based on needs.
67.6	19.2	13.2	4. Change requirement that State set forth a program in which not more than 20% of the funds "...may be used for the education of institutionalized persons". States should be permitted to spend no greater percentage of funds for institutionalized persons than the percent such persons represent of the ABE target population - not to exceed 20%.
86.8	3.3	9.9	5. The mandated cooperative arrangements between the SEA and other agencies should be retained but in an updated, combined manner which also provides for bilateral cooperation.
87.7	3.7	8.6	6. The existence of the National Advisory Council should be continued.
61.5	29.3	9.2	7. Establishment of State Advisory Councils should remain optional.
73.2	14.9	11.9	8. Continue provision for special populations (e.g., Adult Indians, elderly, refugees) but separate appropriations are needed.
76.2	18.2	5.6	9. Continue requirement that "not less than 10%" of each State's funds be used for special experimental demonstration projects and professional staff development.
82.2	6.7	11.1	10. Clearinghouse should be funded adequately and separately.
70.1	17.4	12.5	11. Consider the current 5% limitation or State administration costs as a floor for such costs and possibly increase allowable costs on a matching Federal/State-local incentive basis.
90.9	4.3	4.8	12. Inadequate funding has been the principal limitation of the AE programs - thus future appropriations should be as close to the present authorization (200 million) as possible.

*Testimony by Curtis Ulmer, President of NAPCAE, before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 95th Congress, 1st Session on H.R. 15. July 12, 1977. pp. 52-53.

existing Adult Education Act. Recommendations on each section were made to the Council, and then each section was ranked in terms of priority for needed change. First priority was given to the area of state planning, where they commented that: "If the State Plan and subsequently the local plans are truly a planning document, plans should be three or five-year instruments with a letter of compliance or agreement each year." Besides duration, collaboration with other state and federal programs was also a concern. Specifically, the Council observed that: "Cooperative agreements have generally been one-way agreements," and they need to be strengthened in order to benefit Adult Education.[1/]

Throughout the legislation there are emphases on participatory planning. While these were supported by the Advisory Council, they are based in large part on the work of the Futures Planning Project at the Educational Policy Research Center at Syracuse University, and the work of the National Adult Education Think Tank Project at the University of Maryland. Both of these projects were funded by the Division of Adult Education of the USOE during the period 1972-76, and were based on the assumptions that: (a) planning in adult education is based on a crisis-intervention model while the participatory planning process (which includes a long-range time frame), is based on a crisis-prevention model of management; and (b) the greater the participation of beneficiaries, resource providers and program personnel in the planning and implementation of the program, the more likely the program will reach and effectively serve the intended population.

With respect to revising the purpose of the Act to include an emphasis on functional literacy, Secretary of HEW Califano's statement before the Senate Human Resources Committee of March 8, 1978 explained:

> "The expanded purpose would indicate Federal government recognition of a major problem - that many adults cannot read or write sufficiently well to function in modern society. At the same time, efforts to assist those adults who desire to attain educational credentials such as the high school diploma will continue. To some extent, the two aims are complementary, as functional illiteracy and the lack of a high school diploma are highly related."[2/]

[1/] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 1st Session on S.1753, Part 1, pp. 577-593.

[2/] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 2nd Session on S.1753, Part 3, March 8, 1978, p. 155.

In addition, the expanded promotion of the concept of lifelong learning and the passage, with no appropriations, of the Lifelong Learning Act was of some influence. Through the broadened purpose, the legislation responded to the issue of how to make the national ABE/GED program a viable part of the lifelong learning process.

Also with respect to purpose, although the legislation refers to all segments of the target population, the particular focus is on the following broad groups:

- residents of rural areas
- residents of urban areas with high unemployment
- elderly persons
- adults with limited English proficiency
- institutionalized adults
- adult Indians
- adults from other minority groups
- immigrants
- handicapped persons

With respect to expanding the delivery system and outreach efforts, Secretary Califano's testimony continues:

> "The proposal to expand the delivery system at the local level - to include such groups as community colleges, businesses, community action organizations, and labor unions - would help to reach adults in convenient and hospitable locations...
>
> Among the expected benefits are increased program effectiveness and greater motivation on the part of adults to enter and remain in the program. A more flexible delivery system should make entry into a program more convenient and attractive. Moreover, the content of curriculum and courses could be based on immediate needs of the adult (e.g., learning to read a job advertisement) rather than using traditional elementary and secondary school content. In addition, it is expected that significant numbers of adults not currently being served will be brought into the program by expansion of the delivery system at the local level."[1]

The need for such expansion had been raised previously by several evaluations of the adult education program and summarized by Assistant Secretary of Education, Mary Berry, in her testimony before the Senate Human Resources Subcommittee on October 4, 1977.

---

[1] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 2nd Session on S.1753, Part 3, March 8, 1978, pp. 155 and 156.

At that time she said that: "the adult basic education program seems to work when it reaches the people who need it. The main problem seems to be trying to reach those people, whether it is through television projects, through delivering inexpensive books to them, and similar activities."[1]

In her formal, written statement presented to the committee at the same time, the Assistant Secretary expands and is more negative in her assessment. In her written statement she concludes:

> "Evaluations of the Adult Basic Education program indicate that few of the target population participate, and that even when they do participate, relatively few are helped by the program. The major difficulties are poor outreach and the use of teaching methods which are adequate for young children but are offensive to adults and work poorly. The targeted population needs the services that are provided but the services are not being made available in a form to which that population has access. The evaluation points toward the need for some consideration to be given to developing curricula and to training specialists who are able to teach adult learners. In addition, use of extension agents and initiation of other outreach efforts conducted in conjunction with state and local agencies and community-based organizations might improve our results. Technical assistance and training could draw upon the expertise developed in other OE programs, including the Right to Read program and the National Institute of Education Basic Skills Group."[2]

Closely related to expanded delivery and outreach systems is the issue of student retention. In reviewing reports submitted annually from each of the states, USOE concluded that primary reasons for early termination from the program were lack of child care services for children and transportation to the classrooms. In response to this conclusion, the legislation requires that the states "describe the efforts to be undertaken by the State to assist adult participation in adult education programs through... adequate transportation and meeting child care needs." Since it was recognized that provision of child care and transportation services can be quite expensive, the expectation was that state and local programs would collaborate with other organizations, utilizing existing services or sharing expenses where possible. Thus, the legislation requires states to address the child care and transportation issues and permits them to expend federal funds in these areas, but it provides no new monies and makes no specific requirements regarding the extent of services or expenditures to be made.

---

[1] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 1st session on S.1753, Part 1, October 4, 1977, p. 24.

[2] Ibid., pp. 49 and 50.

C. Initial Implementation of the 1978 Amendments

As conceived by USOE and other supporters of the new legislation, implementation of these changes was to be facilitated by one-year planning grants provided to state departments of education. According to Secretary Califano: "these grants would facilitate a participatory process for identifying literacy needs within the state and the development of a coordinated strategy to meet those needs, involving local education agencies, businesses, industry, community organizations, and other institutions."

However, as the legislation was finally approved, not only were the planning grants not forthcoming, but the states were given only nine months in which to develop and submit their first three-year plan. To be assured continuity of federal funding, the State Plan had to be judged "substantially approvable" by July 1, 1979. In effect, this meant the plans were to comply with all relevant aspects of the new legislation and also conform to federal regulations which were being written at the same time the plans were being developed. Thus, instead of the initially envisioned thoughtful and comprehensive planning process, the states were put in the position of compressing what is ideally a two to three-year participatory process into three or four months.

Essentially, then, many states were forced to violate the spirit of the new Adult Education Act in order to be assured compliance, and USOE had virtually no choice but to assist. Confronted with this dilemma, USOE's Division of Adult Education (DAE) responded as best it could.1/

Recognizing the impending problem, in the summer, DAE began to alert the states and to plan for coping with the situation. Four, three-day, regional meetings with the State Adult Education directors were held in October and November, the first two taking place before the legislation finally was passed. During these meetings, the critical mandates in the new law were presented and discussed along with current USOE interpretations. The purpose of these meetings was to inform the directors of the implications of the legislation, to stimulate their beginning the planning process as quickly as possible, and to obtain inputs to the federal regulation writing process. Essentially, these objectives were accomplished.

Compounding the problems of DAE and the state directors, staffing in the federal offices was quite unstable. In the summer of 1978, HEW centralized the USOE regional offices. This pulled back DAE's ten regional staff from the ten federal regions into the central office, removing the states' close access to the Division's regional program officers and adding another element of uncertainty. The recentralization itself would have posed significant management problems in DAE simply because it, inevitably, stimulated major changes in the headquarters organization. As was expected, several of the regional staff were reluctant to be transferred to Washington and by the time of the last regional meeting in early November, only four of the original ten regional staff were still

1/This conclusion is based on the observations of Development Associates' staff made during meetings and in discussions with State Directors and DAE in the fall and winter of 1978-79 and in the course of conducting case studies of representative states to the planning requirements in the 1978 legislation.

associated with the division -- and the morale of some of those remaining was noticeably low. In addition, the chief of DAE's Program Services Branch, the one to absorb the new regional staff, was himself a new arrival from a regional office and from a position which included adult education but a different focus.[1]

Thus, at the same time DAE was confronting a forced reorganization and new staff it was faced with the implementation of significant changes in the legislation. From the states' perspective, they were being told to substantially change their planning process, develop new organizational ties, and perhaps leave themselves open to hostile pressures from local groups -- all in what everyone readily admitted was an impossibly short period of time. All of this to be done without firm federal guidelines, and without the assurance of dealing through a regional officer with whom they had worked for several years.

In order to observe the state planning process in general, and particularly in search of lessons which would be helpful in preparing for and implementing future planning cycles, it was decided that Development Associates would conduct case studies in seven quite diverse state departments of education.[2] For the most part, the results of these studies will be reported separately. However, the responses of the seven state directors and their staff to questions regarding 18 specific mandates contained in the 1978 legislation are of interest here. In all, 21 SEA staff rated how they thought the specific mandates in the new legislation would affect the quality of adult education in their states. In their ratings they used a seven point scale, with 1 being "harmful," 4 being "no effect" and 7 being "helpful." Not all of the 18 mandates represent changes in the legislation; and overall, it was judged that seven would have very little effect.

On the positive side, seven other mandates were expected to be quite helpful. By far, the most popular was the mandate for three-year planning, with the requirement for participatory planning well received by most but not all. Negatively, four were viewed as being harmful to adult education programs. Staff from the three smallest states (those with one or two state staff each) rated "provision of child care" and "provision of transportation" as "1", i.e., it was considered harmful.

---

[1] The Division of Adult Education is divided into two branches. The Program Services Branch provides services to the federally-funded projects and works with the states in planning and other activities. The Program Development Branch provides internal support for the Adult Education program and the Division by gathering data on state programs, writing regulations, policy statements, etc.

[2] Already competively awarded a contract to conduct a process evaluation of the State Grants program, the sub-study of state responses to the planning requirements of 1978 was viewed as a natural extension of the evaluation activity.

Exhibit 3 contains a summary of the ratings of the SEA personnel to legislative mandates. Also contained in the exhibit is a summary based on legislative materials, literature, and interviews of what appear to be the assumptions or rationale for each of the 18 mandates.

EXHIBIT 3

ASSUMPTIONS AND GOALS OF THE 1978 ADULT EDUCATION LEGISLATION

MANDATES OF THE 1978 ADULT EDUCATION LEGISLATION		DA's Case Study Ques. Responses from State Directors & Staff from 7 States - Jan. 1979 1 = Harmful 4 = No Effect 7 = Helpful (n=21)	
		$\bar{x}$	s
1. 5% LIMIT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION	(a) prevents an inordinately large percentage of money from being spent for administration at the state level, (b) promotes the non-federal share of resources, (c) encourages cooperative agreements at state level, and (d) provides for a stronger commitment on the part of the state.	3.14	1.46
2. 20% LIMIT FOR EQUIVALENCY PROGRAMS	(a) represents a compromise between competency-based advocates and GED/equivalency advocates, (b) is necessary to keep many programs from spending an unproportionate amount on equivalency programs, and (c) is an arbitrary figure (20%) but seems to be realistic based on program input.	3.29	1.60
3. PROVISION OF CHILD CARE	(a) gives the target population the opportunity and time to participate in AE programs; a significant portion of the eligible population does not participate in AE programs because of child care responsibilities, (b) can be provided without additional AE federal funds, and (c) can be provided through interagency cooperation or from state and local funds.	3.5	2.62
4. PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION	(a) gives the target population the opportunity and "access to" AE programs; a significant portion of the eligible population does not participate in AE programs because of lack of transportation, (b) can be provided without additional AE federal funds, and (c) can be provided through interagency cooperation or from state and local funds.	3.5	2.62
5. PROVIDING FISCAL CONTROL	(a) assures cost-effectiveness and accountability.	4.14	.38
6. 10% MINIMUM FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION	(a) assures that a certain percentage of the grant is spent on special programs and teacher training, (b) places a fairly high priority (relative to money spent on other aspects of the program) on special programs and teacher training, and (c) will require dissemination of results of projects to others in the state; a significant problem in the past.	4.29	.49
7. ASSISTANCE TO ADULTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS	(a) is needed for these persons to become part of the economic mainstream which requires basic skills in reading and writing in English, and (b) provides their participation in a host of training programs.	4.29	.76
8. ASSISTING ADULTS IN URBAN AREAS WITH HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT	(a) is needed because this population has special needs including lack of basic skills, lack of educational resources, and often cultural differences.	4.43	.79
9. ASSISTING MINORITIES/ HANDICAPPED, ETC.	(a) is necessary to include all segments of the adult population, and (b) is needed because these populations have special needs such as cultural differences, lack of basic resources, lack of accessibility to programs, etc.	4.43	.79
10. ASSISTING INSTITUTIONALIZED ADULTS	(a) will give the institutionalized the same programs as others; they have the rights to equal treatment, (b) provides for a means of impacting on given segments of the adult population, (c) is needed because these adults often have special needs (varying with type of institution, etc.), and (d) contribute to rehabilitation goals vs. punitive goals.	4.43	.79
11. SETTING CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING LOCAL PROPOSALS	(a) provides the best means for assessing proposals and fairly distributing AE funds, (b) must be established due to the number of programs competing for limited funds, and (c) assures competitiveness among AE programs which will result in better quality programs and expanded delivery systems.	4.43	1.81

ASSUMPTIONS AND GOALS OF THE 1978 ADULT EDUCATION LEGISLATION (Con't)

MANDATES OF THE 1978 ADULT EDUCATION LEGISLATION		DA's Case Study Ques. Responses from State Directors & Staff from 7 States - Jan. 1979 1 = Harmful 4 = No Effect 7 = Helpful (n=21)	
		$\bar{x}$	s
12. EXPANDED DELIVERY SYSTEM (TO NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS)	(a) will extend service delivery to targeted population not currently being covered, and (b) will provide them access to AE services target group shuns classroom atmosphere, teacher-student relationship - would be better learners in their own environment (community centers, work, etc.). AE program is more than an academically-oriented educational program.	4.71	.761
13. ASSISTING ADULTS IN RURAL AREAS	(a) is needed because adults in rural areas have special personal needs and circumstances such as lack of educational resources and different workday schedules than urban adults, and (b) is needed to increase attendance in rural areas caused by present inaccessibility to programs due to distance, transportation and limited outreach.	4.71	.95
14. EXPANDED OUTREACH (TO ALL SEGMENTS OF THE ADULT POPULATION)	(a) AE programs need to involve themselves more in "seeking out" participants representative of all segments of the adult population, (b) this can be carried out without additional federal resources, (c) this will be most effective through cooperative agreements with a host of community-oriented programs, and (d) can be part of the 10% non-federal share of operating AE programs.	4.71	1.11
15. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS	(a) identify the problems and assess the needs of the target population which are necessary to address in AE programs, (b) should be completed before developing programs to address problems, and (c) provide for useful input and participation by target population.	4.71	1.89
16. ESTABLISHING INNOVATIVE PROJECTS FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS	(a) will motivate special segments of the adult population in new and innovative ways, (b) will serve as a research base for bettering the quality of AE directed toward these populations and other groups, and (c) will promote staff competence.	4.86	.90
17. PARTICIPATORY PLANNING	(a) helps ensure success by making responsible constituencies a part of the decision making process, (b) will serve as a basis for effective person-to-person outreach, (c) will help keep program planners "honest," and (d) will help identify resources and support for program, especially expansion of program.	5.0	1.9
18. THREE-YEAR PLAN	(a) promotes stability, (b) promotes continuity, (c) promotes flow of funding, (d) promotes security, and (e) requires provision for continuing evaluation and adjustments.	6.0	1.0

Note: $\bar{x}$ = mean; s = standard deviation.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

Much can be learned about the adult education program through a study of available information. Each year the Division of Adult Education (DAE) receives program performance reports and financial reports from each state. DAE also receives copies of evaluations of special projects and a variety of other materials funded through the state grants. In addition, each state submits an annual state plan which contains much descriptive information. Based on a schedule of five to ten states per year, each state also is visited by a team from USOE for a Management Evaluation Review for Compliance (MERC) which results in a report addressing the state program's compliance with each of the federal regulations.

In addition to what is available from DAE, program information from the states is regularly available from the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination in USOE as part of the annual reports mandated by Section 437 of the General Education Provision Act. Also, considerable descriptive information which has been collected on a one-time basis is available from the National Advisory Council on Adult Education and from the Adult Education Clearinghouse (ADELL) funded through the Adult Education Act.

A summary of the reports by state for the 1977-78 program year which were available for review through DAE or OED is presented as Exhibit 2.1. As is apparent from the exhibit, some reports were missing in every category, although the sets of APR, Financial Status, and 437 Reports were almost complete[1/].

With respect to the Annual Performance Reports, beginning with data from the 1966-67 program year, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has worked with DAE to prepare an annual summary of the state data. The most recently available NCES report (still in draft form) summarizes information for the 1975-76 program year[2/]. Since 1973, there have been three versions of the Adult Education Annual Performance Report, the most recent being OE Form 365-1, dated June 1977. A revision to this form reflecting the requirements of the 1978 legislation is being developed and will be forthcoming to be used in the 1980-81 program year.

1/ Information in the table is based on what was available to Development Associates, after repeated attempts during the period October 1978-March 1979 to secure the reports; some reports were not submitted to USOE, others were not located. Throughout, personnel in DAE were quite helpful.

2/ National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Adult Education: Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics. Students and Staff Data July 1, 1975-June 30, 1976 and Selected Summaries of Fiscal Years 1972-76. Draft obtained from NCES in fall 1978 and confirmed as still the most current version and most current data as of March 1, 1979.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXHIBIT 2.1
AVAILABILITY OF SELECTED ADULT EDUCATION REPORTS FROM USOE*

	Annual Performance Reports	Narrative Supplement to APR	Financial Status Report	Sec. 437 Reports	State or Local Evaluation Reports	MERC
1. Alabama	X		X	X	X	1978
2. Alaska	X		X	X		1977
3. Arizona	X		X	X		-
4. Arkansas	X		X	X		1976
5. California	X		X	X		-
6. Colorado	X		X			1976
7. Connecticut	X		X	X		-
8. Delaware	X	X	X	X		-
9. District of Columbia	X		X	X		1977
10. Florida	X		X	X		-
11. Georgia	X		X	X	X	1978
12. Hawaii	X		X	X		1978
13. Idaho	X		X	X		1977
14. Illinois	X		X	X	X	-
15. Indiana	X				X	-
16. Iowa	X		X	X		1976
17. Kansas	X		X	X		-
18. Kentucky	X		X	X		-
19. Louisiana	X		X	X		1977-79*
20. Maine	X		X	X		1976
21. Maryland	X		X	X		1978
22. Massachusetts	X		X	X	X	1978
23. Michigan	X	X	X	X	X	1979*
24. Minnesota	X		X	X		1978
25. Mississippi	X			X		-
26. Missouri	X		X	X		-
27. Montana	X		X	X		1977
28. Nebraska	X		X	X		1977
29. Nevada	X		X	X		-
30. New Hampshire	X		X	X		1979*
31. New Jersey	X		X	X		1979*
32. New Mexico	X			X		1978
33. New York	X		X	X	X	1976
34. North Carolina	X		X			-
35. North Dakota	X	X	X	X		1978
36. Ohio	X		X	X		1977
37. Oklahoma	X		X	X		-
38. Oregon	X		X	X	X	1978
39. Pennsylvania	X		X	X		-
40. Rhode Island	X		X	X		1979*
41. South Carolina	X		X	X		-
42. South Dakota	X	X	X	X		1978
43. Tennessee	X	X	X	X		1977
44. Texas	X		X	X	X	-
45. Utah	X		X	X		1977
46. Vermont	X		X	X		1977
47. Virginia	X		X	X		1976
48. [illegible]				X		-
49. [illegible]	X		X	X		1977
50. [illegible]	X		X	X		-
51. [illegible]	X	X	X	X		-

*During the period October 1978-March 1979, repeated attempts, with full USOE cooperation. were made to secure copies of all reports. Submission of state and local evaluation reports is optional and MERCs (Management Evaluation Review for Compliance) are being conducted on a staggered schedule; copies of the other reports from each of the states were expected.

Because the APR data are the most complete available and because the validity and utility of some of the data have been questioned informally by some state adult education program directors, an assessment of the quality of the data was of interest. Thus, during visits to a representative sample of ten states in the Spring of 1979, the state directors were asked to rate the overall accuracy of the 15 categories of data contained in the Annual Performance Reports[1/]. A summary of their ratings is presented as Exhibit 2.2.

As shown by the distribution of mean ratings across the 15 APR data categories, almost three of the ten state directors (i.e., a mean of 2.7) gave the data an overall accuracy rating of 80% or less. Also, half or more of the respondents gave five of the categories an accuracy rating of 80% or less. When asked why they rated these items so relatively low, the most frequently given reasons were that there was no followup at either the state or local levels and that frequently this data were not submitted to the states. Indeed, two respondents indicated that they believed the data they received were quite accurate, but that so much was missing that it thoroughly invalidated what they reported to the federal levels.

More positively, it is of note that most of the APR data were highly regarded by the state directors (e.g., over six of the ten directors rated the data as being 95% or 100% accurate). In the remainder of this chapter, data from the APR and other cited sources are summarized in order to provide as accurate an overview of the state and local program as available data permit.

A. Types and Amounts of Federal Grants

Funds from the Adult Education Act are allocated each year to the states to aid them in funding their adult education program. The Federal grants began in FY65 with a total allotment of $18,612,000 and has grown to an estimated allotment for FY79 of $90,750,000. The estimated distribution of the FY79 monies is as follows: (1) $907,500 reserved for outlying areas, (2) each state, D.C. and Puerto Rico receiving a floor amount of $150,000, and (3) the remainder distributed on the basis of the number of persons 16 and over with less than a high school education based on the 1970 Census. Twenty-nine states had grants of more than one million dollars with the four largest being New York (7,512,984), California (6,648,292), Pennsylvania (5,071,342), and Texas (4,963,583). The smallest state amount was $231,019, granted to Alaska.

Exhibit 2.3 shows the allocation of funds to each state for fiscal years 1965 and 1979.

Within each state the federal funds are utilized for state level administrative expenses, state advisory councils, research and special projects, and various types of instructional projects.

1/Responses from seven of the state directors were gathered as part of the state planning sub-study; responses from the other three were collected during field tests of the instruments to be used in the main study. The ten states are: California, Deleware, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York and Virginia.

EXHIBIT 2.2

APR ACCURACY RATINGS

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM TEN STATE ADULT EDUCATION DIRECTORS TO THE QUESTION:

"Overall, how do you rate the accuracy of the following types of data included in the Adult Education Annual Performance Reports?"

APR DATA CATEGORIES	Number of Respondents per Performance Report Accuracy Rating						
	100%	95%	90%	80%	70%	60%	50% or Less
TABLE 1							
1. Number of participants by age	2	6	1				1
2. Number of participants by race and selected ethnic groups	3	4	1	1			1
3. Number of participants by sex	6	2	1				1
TABLE 2							
4. Number of enrollees by instructional level		9		1			
5. Number of completions by instructional level	1	5	2	1			1
6. Number of separations by instructional level	1	5	3	1			
7. Number separating, for 10 specified reasons (not including "other" and "unknown")		2	1	3	2	1	1
TABLE 3							
8. Number of participants by class location	4	5	1				
9. Number of classes by location	4	5	1				
TABLE 4							
10. Number of paid personnel by type of job performed	6	3	1				
11. Number of paid personnel taking training by type of job performed	3	6					1
TABLE 5							
12. Number of persons on waiting lists to enter program	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
13. Number of persons enrolled in other educational training programs		1	2	1	2		4
14. Number of persons who obtained job as a result of experience gained in program	1	1	1	3	1		3
15. Number of persons who received driver's license	1	1	2	2	1		3
Mean number of respondents across the 15 APR data categories	2.2	3.8	1.3	.9	.5	.1	1.2

EXHIBIT 2.3

ABE STATE ALLOTMENTS* FOR FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1979

	FY 1965	FY 1979**
TOTALS	$18,612,000	$90,750,000
Alabama	579,267	1,788,980
Alaska	20,000	231,019
Arizona	174,081	769,742
Arkansas	316,910	1,099,144
California	1,862,617	6,648,292
Colorado	92,896	829,716
Connecticut	213,231	1,275,606
Delaware	50,000	353,315
District of Columbia	69,535	445,114
Florida	560,165	2,972,916
Georgia	746,268	2,314,934
Hawaii	84,613	386,144
Idaho	25,000	394,563
Illinois	962,007	4,521,894
Indiana	209,674	2,168,392
Iowa	109,844	1,127,497
Kansas	95,711	917,292
Kentucky	601,447	1,747,260
Louisiana	824,745	1,788,144
Maine	54,880	530,275
Maryland	307,287	1,680,358
Massachusetts	427,390	2,151,668
Michigan	630,619	3,544,162
Minnesota	155,112	1,452,249
Mississippi	-0-	1,182,887
Missouri	382,898	2,136,877
Montana	11,629	388,278
Nebraska	64,304	657,556
Nevada	50,000	297,955
New Hampshire	50,000	411,882
New Jersey	570,290	3,026,806
New Mexico	111,400	511,985
New York	1,765,279	7,512,984
North Carolina	831,799	2,659,323
North Dakota	-0-	389,977
Ohio	660,369	4,271,088
Oklahoma	228,156	1,198,479
Oregon	74,867	874,987
Pennsylvania	988,206	5,071,342
Rhode Island	76,382	569,204
South Carolina	499,369	1,415,645
South Dakota	12,700	402,138
Tennessee	602,910	2,027,219
Texas	1,433,423	4,963,583
Utah	50,000	438,736
Vermont	50,000	306,369
Virginia	132,847	2,150,527
Washington	122,745	1,234,711
West Virginia	237,019	955,562
Wisconsin	25,869	1,769,760
Wyoming	50,000	256,325

NOTE: FY 1965 allotments available for expenditure through June 30, 1966; 1979 grants available only through year of award.

* Adapted from National Advisory Council on Adult Education - 1977 - Section II Futures and Amendments - Survey of State Support p. 260-262.

** Estimated distribution of $90,750,000 with 1% ($907,500) reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed with a basic amount of $150,000 to each State, D.C., and Puerto Rico, and the remainder distributed on the basis of those 16 and over with less than a high school diploma (1970 Census).

The amount available for use for state administration of the program is set by federal legislation -- approximately five percent of the total state allotment with a minimum of $35,000 (with the amendments of 1978, now $50,000) per state.

The Adult Education Act permits federal funds to be expended in support of state level advisory councils. However, on the basis of information contained in the state financial status reports for FY1977 and summarized below in Exhibit 2.4 (the most current, nearly complete set available), only four states reported expending monies for advisory councils. This may be because these funds are to be a portion of those available for state level administration[1]/ and the councils must conform to provisions in the legislation and federal administrative regulations.

EXHIBIT 2.4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STATES EXPENDING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR ADULT EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCILS*, FY1977

	With Expenditures	With No Expenditures	Not Reporting	TOTAL
Number	4	40	7	51
Percent	7.8	78.5	13.7	100

*Data from State Financial Reports, FY1977.

Section 310 of the 1978 amendments provide that not less than ten percent of the funds allocated to the states shall be used for special projects. These may involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials or programs, or may be part of community schools programs which have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problem of persons with educational deficiencies, or may be for training present or potential program personnel. The previous legislation included as (Section 309) the same provisions and also permitted, under section 306(a)(4), the states to make grants to public and private non-profit agencies for special projects, teacher training or research. Exhibit 2.5 presents a summary of the number of states reporting expenditures in FY1977 in these areas.

1/As opposed to being taken from monies for local instructional projects, special projects, etc. State vocational education advisory councils, on the other hand, have a relatively large, separate funding base.

EXHIBIT 2.5

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STATES EXPENDING FEDERAL FUNDS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS, TEACHER TRAINING OR RESEARCH BY TYPE OF EXPENDITURE, FY1977

	Sec. 306(a)(4)			Sec. 309(1)(2)	
	Special Projects	Teacher Training	Research	Special Projects	Teacher Training
Number (%) with Expenditures	6 (12%)	13 (25%)	4 (8%)	40 (78%)	35 (69%)
Number (%) with No Expenditures	40 (78%)	33 (65%)	42 (82%)	6 (12%)	11 (22%)
Number (%) Not Reporting	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	5 (10%)	5 (10%)

The majority of federal funds are expended on various types of instructional activities through grants made by the states to projects at the local level. All states are required to place emphasis on adult basic education programs. Since 1970, the legislation has permitted some expenditures on high school level programs for adults. According to the information available from the FY1977 Financial Status Reports, 57% of the states expended federal funds for programs at the secondary school level and another ten percent reported they considered adult secondary education (ASE) programs to be part of the overall Adult Education Act supported program in their state but that they did not expend federal monies at that level. Data were missing from another ten percent 1/, and 24% of the states reported that they did not include ASE as part of their federally-supported program. In the case of at least some of the states, the exclusion of ASE is for administrative convenience (i.e., it eliminates the need for federal reporting) and does not imply there is no ASE program in the state. Indeed, in California and New York, for example, there are very large and complex ASE efforts, but data on them are not included in the Adult Education Act related reports. Exhibit 2.6 provides a summary of the number of states including ASE as part of their federally-supported Adult Education program.

1/ Financial status reports from four states and part of a report from a fifth were unavailable. The states are: Indiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Dakota and Washington.

EXHIBIT 2.6

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STATES WITH PROGRAMS OF ADULT SECONDARY EDUCATION FUNDED THROUGH THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT (Grades 9-12)*

	Federal Money for ASE Prog.	ASE Prog. but no. Fed. Money	No ASE Program	Not Reporting	TOTAL
Number of States	29	5	12	5	51
Percent	56.9	9.8	23.5	9.8	100

*Data from State Financial Reports, FY1977. All states have federally-supported adult education programs of instruction at lower grade levels.

In addition to adult basic and secondary education, the federal legislation encourages provision of instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual education. In some states and ESL activities constitute a major and separately funded component of the program. In FY1977, for example, Texas and New York each reported spending over one million dollars for ESL projects, and it has been estimated that in 1979 approximately 50% of the participants in the adult education program in New York are in ESL programs; about one-third of these are estimated to be non-English speakers and the other two-thirds to be of limited English speaking ability[1/]. As summarized in Exhibit 2.7, below, in FY1977, 19 states reported spending Adult Education Act monies for ESL programs and 27 reported they did not; again the reports from five states were not available.

EXHIBIT 2.7

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STATES WITH PROGRAMS FOR PERSONS OF LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY FUNDED THROUGH THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT*

	With Expenditures	With No Expenditures	Not Reporting	TOTAL
Number	19	27	5	51
Percent	37.3	52.9	9.8	100

*Data from State Financial Reports, FY1977.

1/ Verbally reported (and subsequently discussed with DA) by a member of the New York State Education Agency, Adult Education Program staff at meetings of Adult Education Program federal and state officials. Alexandria, Virginia. May 24, 1979.

Exhibit 2.8 summarizes information from the FY1977 functional status reports on programs of instruction for institutionalized persons for grades 1-8 and grades 9-12. Twenty-eight states and D.C. have programs for grades 1-8 and 19 states and D.C. have programs for grades 9-12; reports for five states were not available. Again there are states that have programs, but do not use federal funds (2 for grades 1-8 and 3 for grades 9-12). Also one state reported having programs for training of institutionalized persons but alloted the monies in another place

EXHIBIT 2.8

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STATES WITH PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION FOR INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS FUNDED THROUGH THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT*

	Federal Money for Program	Program but No Fed. Money	No Program	Not Reporting	TOTAL
Grades 1-8 Number	29	2	15	5	51
Percent	56.9	3.9	29.4	9.8	100
Grades 9-12 Number	20	3	23	5	51
Percent	39.2	5.9	45.1	9.8	100

*Data from State Financial Reports, FY1977.

In addition to the grant programs mentioned above, the Federal government also provides emergency funding as the need arises. One such need was the increased demand for adult classes brought about in 1976 by the large number of Indochinese refugees entering the U.S. that year. The draft of Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics for FY1976, published by the National Center for Education Statistics, reports that 990 grants were awarded. Of these, 971 went to Local Educational Agencies, 12 to other public agencies, and seven to other private agencies.

B. State and Local Funding

The Adult Education Act provides that the federal share of the expenditures needed to carry out the State Plan shall be no more than 90 per centum (except with respect to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific where the federal share may be 100 per centum. The Act also provides that the amount available from non-federal sources for one year may not be less than the preceeding year; i.e., the level of non-federal effort must be maintained.

The states vary considerably with respect to the proportion and source of the non-federal share of their adult education programs. They also vary with respect to the extent and manner in which data on non-federal expenditures are collected and reported. In several states, there is a deliberate policy not to collect and report to USOE all non-federal contributions. That is, to avoid being obligated to maintain the same level of effort in the future, they report only the minimum amount required. In some of these cases, no effort is made to collect complete data on non-federal expenditures while in others, data are collected but not reported to USOE. Some states report only the minimum amount required to USOE and report other, more complete data, to other organizations (e.g., NACAE).

Exhibit 2.9, taken from information reported to NACAE[1/], provides the state/federal ratio and percent of federal, state, and local monies for FY1976. California and Florida showed the highest state/federal ratio, 12.18 and 11.76 respectively. Although five states showed no state funding at all, each of these did have local funding which equaled at least the required ten percent non-federal share. Fifteen states reported 85% of their monies at the state from federal funding. Florida and the District of Columbia ported they received more than 85% of their monies at the state and district levels respectively. Twelve states (including D.C.) received more than 50% of their funding from state monies. Twenty states report over half their funding is from non-federal sources.

C. Organization and Staffing

Although each state has an adult education program, their organizational structure varies considerably. For example, in Alabama the program is a part of the Division of Post-secondary and Continuing Education, in Arizona it is under the Associate Superintendent for General Education Services, in Maine it is part of the Bureau of Vocational Education, and in Vermont the ABE and GED programs are under the Division of Teacher, Continuing Education, Research, and Development. In each of these and every other state except North Dakota, the program is structurally located within the SEA; in North Dakota, the SEA has delegated responsibility for the

1/ National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Adult Education, Futures and Amendments: Survey of State Support Section II. November 1977.

EXHIBIT 2.9

COMPARISONS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR FY1976*

	Federal Funds in 1976 (millions of dollars)	FY 1976 Funding			
		Ratio of State/Fed. Dollars	% Federal	% State	% Local
1. Alabama	1.34	.22	75.0	16.8	8.2
2. Alaska	.19	3.17	16.6	52.8	30.6
3. Arizona	.52	.67	60.0	40.0	0
4. Arkansas	.83	1.01	49.7	50.3	0
5. California	4.51	12.18	4.2	51.2	44.6
6. Colorado	.60	0	78.6	0	21.4
7. Connecticut	1.00	.92	32.1	29.6	38.4
8. Delaware	.27	.92	49.2	45.2	5.6
9. District of Columbia	.37	7.63	11.6	88.4	N/A
10. Florida	2.29	11.76	7.8	92.2	0
11. Georgia	1.57	.58	60.0	35.0	5.0
12. Hawaii	.32	4.28	13.2	56.7	30.0
13. Idaho	.32	0	87.0	0	13.0
14. Illinois	3.53	.14	87.6	12.4	0
15. Indiana	1.63	.22	69.9	15.5	14.6
16. Iowa	.95	0	35.2	0	64.8
17. Kansas	.76	.11	90.2	9.8	0
18. Kentucky	1.23	.30	77.0	23.0	0
19. Louisiana	1.44	.98	43.6	42.7	13.7
20. Maine	.45	.13	86.8	11.3	1.9
21. Maryland	1.16	.60	62.4	37.6	N/A
22. Massachusetts	1.71	.27	27.7	7.5	64.8
23. Michigan	2.77	1.10	40.8	45.0	14.2
24. Minnesota	1.15	.37	63.7	23.4	12.9
25. Mississippi	.95	.08	85.0	6.5	8.5
26. Missouri	1.77	.12	89.3	10.7	0
27. Montana	.33	.01	89.3	0.8	9.9
28. Nebraska	.49	.05	76.2	3.7	20.1
29. Nevada	.21	3.24	21.2	68.8	10.0
30. New Hampshire	.33	.05	69.6	3.2	27.2
31. New Jersey	2.21	1.53	28.2	43.2	28.6
32. New Mexico	.40	.25	80.1	19.9	0
33. New York	3.85	1.47	38.9	57.0	4.1
34. North Carolina	2.05	.12	89.1	10.9	0
35. North Dakota	.38	0	89.5	0	10.5
36. Ohio	3.25	.14	78.2	11.0	10.9
37. Oklahoma	.99	.01	90.9	.8	8.2
38. Oregon	.65	2.21	22.7	50.2	27.1
39. Pennsylvania	4.10	.002	91.0	0.2	8.7
40. Rhode Island	.54	.29	49.4	14.3	36.3
41. South Carolina	1.12	2.18	27.5	60.0	12.6
42. South Dakota	.35	.02	90.6	1.5	7.9
43. Tennessee	1.45	.10	86.9	8.6	4.6
44. Texas	3.28	1.62	34.1	55.1	10.7
45. Utah	.34	3.51	22.2	77.8	0
46. Vermont	.28	.10	91.1	8.9	0
47. Virginia	1.21	.22	63.9	14.1	22.0
48. Washington	.92	.29	77.7	22.3	N/A
49. West Virginia	.84	.30	77.0	23.0	0
50. Wisconsin	1.10	.30	53.5	16.2	30.2
51. Wyoming	.22	0	87.4	0	12.6

*Adapted from: National Advisory Council on Adult Education, Adult Education, Future and Amendments, Survey of State Support. November 1977. Section II.

program to the state university. The NACAE Annual Report for 1977 contains an organizational chart showing the location of the program for each state[1].

The 1976 Draft ABE/ASE statistics present several tables on staff and student size, and Exhibit 2.10 on the following pages provides a summary of those tables. In general, the administrative structure and location of the program and the size of the administrative staff varies, without any relationship to either the size or scope of the program.

As is apparent from a review of the first three columns of the Exhibit, the states vary with respect to their relative emphasis on the use of full-time and part-time personnel. The lower the ratio in the third column ("Ratio Total Personnel/Full-Time Equivalent"), the greater the reliance on full-time, or nearly full-time, staff.

Exhibit 2.10 also provides a between-state description of the number of students and staff. In interpreting the ratio of the number of students per teacher (column 10), it should be noted that the "Teacher" column includes both full and part-time teachers. Therefore, one should be careful in drawing conclusions, for example, about California's high number of students per teacher when compared to New York's low number of students per teacher. Notice that in the third column ("Ratio Total Personnel/Full-Time Equivalent"), New York had a much larger ratio than California indicating that New York hired more part-time personnel. This ratio was for all personnel, not simply teachers; thus a statement cannot be made that teachers were the only type of personnel hired part-time. Another factor to consider is the number of paraprofessionals hired. California hired almost three times as many as did New York. Again, it is not known whether the paraprofessionals were full or part-time or in what capacity they were used.

[1] National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Adult Education, Futures and Amendments: Survey of State Support Section II. November 1977.

EXHIBIT 2.10

NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND STAFF IN ADULT BASIC AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAM BY STATE OR TERRITORY*

		PROGRAM PERSONNEL				
		(1) TOTAL PERSONNEL	(2) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT PERSONNEL	(3) RATIO TOTAL PERSONNEL/ FULL-TIME EQUIV.	(4) LOCAL ADMINISTRATORS	(5) STATE ADMINISTRATORS
	TOTALS**	54,336	14,321.8	3.8	4,315	219
1.	Alabama	827	119.0	4.2	76	8
2.	Alaska	119	61.3	1.9	15	2
3.	Arizona	467	36.3	12.9	14	4
4.	Arkansas	390	126.4	3.1	101	10
5.	California	3,412	1,579.9	2.2	159	6
6.	Colorado	338	98.4	3.4	38	0
7.	Connecticut	588	105.1	5.6	33	1
8.	Delaware	79	29.8	2.7	9	1
9.	District of Columbia	374	286.0	1.3	44	4
10.	Florida	7,244	2,014.9	3.6	268	5
11.	Georgia	894	192.0	4.7	83	5
12.	Hawaii	338	44.7	7.6	10	2
13.	Idaho	203	51.5	3.9	11	0
14.	Illinois	2,042	850.0	2.4	149	12
15.	Indiana	550	269,9	2.0	42	3
16.	Iowa	1,124	185.0	6.1	48	4
17.	Kansas	407	124.7	3.3	49	2
18.	Kentucky	822	185.0	4.4	99	6
19.	Louisiana	591	111.7	5.3	81	3
20.	Maine	244	65.7	4.5	42	1
21.	Maryland	929	212.0	4.4	15	5
22.	Massachusetts	418	141.7	2.9	41	3
23.	Michigan	4,903	1,683.0	2.9	308	4
24.	Minnesota	414	100.1	4.1	62	2
25.	Mississippi	697	159.8	4.4	91	5
26.	Missouri	1,038	213.8	4.9	58	7
27.	Montana	108	47.4	2.3	5	1
28.	Nebraska	347	82.7	4.2	24	3
29.	Nevada	88	30.0	2.9	8	5
30.	New Hampshire	383	35.9	10.7	49	2
31.	New Jersey	807	355.8	2.3	96	2
32.	New Mexico	255	58.2	4.4	19	4
33.	New York	2,391	523.0	4.6	105	5
34.	North Carolina	1.565	439.0	3.6	128	4
35.	North Dakota	148	33.9	4.4	30	0
36.	Ohio	1,199	290.6	4.1	109	3
37.	Oklahoma	635	131.0	4.8	54	5
38.	Oregon	326	91.0	3.6	29	2
39.	Pennsylvania	5,120	767.0	6.7	720	2
40.	Rhode Island	223	54.7	3.7	20	2
41.	South Carolina	2,612	352.0	7.4	230	12
42.	South Dakota	180	39.0	4.6	25	0
43.	Tennessee	836	126.4	6.6	89	9
44.	Texas	3,178	646.0	4.9	321	17
45.	Utah	942	228.2	4.1	75	2
46.	Vermont	272	105.0	2.6	12	2
47.	Virginia	757	110.9	6.8	76	0
48.	Washington	419	57.7	7.3	36	1
49.	West Virginia	180	70.0	2.6	11	1
50.	Wisconsin	333	177.0	1.9	28	2
51.	Wyoming	118	38.0	3.0	15	1

* Taken from Tables 15 and 16 Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics - Draft version 1976.

**Totals include territories (not shown in this display).

EXHIBIT 2.10 (Cont.)
NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND STAFF IN ADULT BASIC AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAM BY STATE OR TERRITORY*

		PROGRAM PERSONNEL				
		(6) COUNSELORS	(7) PARA-PROFESSIONALS	(8) TEACHERS	(9) NUMBER OF STUDENTS	(10) NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER TEACHER
	TOTALS**	2,543	7,694	39,565	1,651,094	41.7
1.	Alabama	17	106	620	28,194	45.5
2.	Alaska	1	64	37	3,618	97.8
3.	Arizona	3	172	274	5,476	19.9 (20.0)
4.	Arkansas	13	49	217	6,555	30.2
5.	California	140	670	2,437	256,819	105.4
6.	Colorado	32	115	153	7,667	50.1
7.	Connecticut	35	49	470	15,655	33.3
8.	Delaware	7	29	33	2,985	90.5
9.	District of Columbia	4	18	304	21,347	70.2
10.	Florida	260	293	6,418	265,625	41.4
11.	Georgia	12	50	744	42,238	56.8
12.	Hawaii	0	0	326	16,508	50.6
13.	Idaho	2	69	121	7,813	64.6
14.	Illinois	58	128	1,695	59,930	35.4
15.	Indiana	27	154	324	15,621	48.2
16.	Iowa	24	76	972	36,591	37.6
17.	Kansas	34	46	276	11,448	41.5
18.	Kentucky	97	88	532	24,346	45.8
19.	Louisiana	24	75	408	13,211	32.4
20.	Maine	8	29	164	4,293	26.2
21.	Maryland	40	67	802	23,858	29.7
22.	Massachusetts	28	100	246	17,356	70.6
23.	Michigan	198	678	3,715	81,409	21.9
24.	Minnesota	42	74	234	6,983	29.8
25.	Mississippi	46	0	555	10,031	18.1
26.	Missouri	48	229	696	26,039	37.4
27.	Montana	12	21	69	3,340	48.4
28.	Nebraska	7	76	237	7,468	31.5
29.	Nevada	6	6	63	2,359	37.4
30.	New Hampshire	45	100	187	4,188	22.4
31.	New Jersey	69	74	566	23,039	40.7
32.	New Mexico	8	28	196	7,167	36.6
33.	New York	55	232	1,994	58.016	29.1
34.	North Carolina	43	98	1,292	81,366	63.0
35.	North Dakota	9	13	96	2.239	23.3
36.	Ohio	46	305	736	39,483	53.6
37.	Oklahoma	27	35	514	13,230	25.7
38.	Oregon	15	55	225	16,517	73.4
39.	Pennsylvania	722	790	2,886	47,764	16.6
40.	Rhode Island	3	67	131	4,199	32.1
41.	South Carolina	53	550	1,767	82,451	46.7
42.	South Dakota	12	29	114	3,691	32.4
43.	Tennessee	29	36	673	18,904	28.1
44.	Texas	80	607	2,153	122,437	56.9
45.	Utah	36	66	763	15,918	20.9
46.	Vermont	0	180	78	3,780	48.5
47.	Virginia	21	130	530	16,711	31.5
48.	Washington	20	54	308	11,073	36.0
49.	West Virginia	0	3	165	13,760	83.4
50.	Wisconsin	13	41	249	12,693	51.0
51.	Wyoming	7	60	35	2,100	60.0

* Taken from Tables 15 and 16 Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics- Draft version 1976.

** Totals include territories (not shown in this display).

Other organizational and staffing characteristics also vary across the states. Teachers' salaries and average cost of ABE/ASE instruction per 100 hours of instruction, for example, vary considerably. In 1976, the national average state salary per hour for ABE/ASE teacher was $8.19 with Massachusetts and New York having the highest at $12.50 per hour and with Vermont having the lowest at $4.25. The average cost of ABE/ASE instruction per 100 hours in 1976 was $125.55, with Alaska having the highest at $470.00 and with Connecticut having the lowest at $15.72[1]. Such differences in costs are often due largely to demographic differences between states; e.g., living costs in Alaska are very high, the population density is very low, and the land size very large.

Staff development activities also vary considerably across the states. Exhibit 2.11 displays the number and percent of program personnel by state who received adult education related training as reported for FY1976. In interpreting these data, it should be noted that the meaning of the word "training" can vary from a one-hour inservice seminar to university coursework for academic credit.

As discussed earlier, it has been possible to provide training to program staff with funds available through Sections 306(a)(4) and 309 of the Adult Education Act (Section 310 in the 1978 amendments). Exhibit 2.12 provides the number of teacher training and other special projects funded through Section 309 as reported for FY1976. As shown, Ohio and Indiana had the largest number of projects, with 49 and 41 respectively. The next were Pennsylvania with 24 and Florida

[1] National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Adult Education, Futures and Amendments: Survey of State Support. Section II. November 1977.

EXHIBIT 2.11

NUMBER OF STAFF IN ADULT BASIC AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND PERCENT TRAINED BY STATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976*

STATE	Total Personnel	Number Trained	Percent Trained
TOTALS**	54,368	37,274	69
1. Alabama	827	606	73
2. Alaska	119	78	66
3. Arizona	467	243	52
4. Arkansas	390	186	48
5. California	3,412	3,056	90
6. Colorado	338	229	68
7. Connecticut	588	550	94
8. Delaware	79	48	61
9. District of Columbia	374	345	92
10. Florida	7,244	2,406	33
11. Georgia	894	761	85
12. Hawaii	338	191	57
13. Idaho	203	145	71
14. Illinois	2,042	987	48
15. Indiana	550	413	75
16. Iowa	1,124	995	89
17. Kansas	407	207	51
18. Kentucky	822	782	95
19. Louisiana	591	399	68
20. Maine	291	292	99
21. Maryland	929	812	87
22. Massachusetts	418	261	62
23. Michigan	4,903	3,456	70
24. Minnesota	414	299	72
25. Mississippi	697	608	87
26. Missouri	1,038	884	85
27. Montana	108	95	88
28. Nebraska	347	247	71
29. Nevada	88	88	100
30. New Hampshire	383	340	89
31. New Jersey	807	759	94
32. New Mexico	255	224	88
33. New York	2,391	1,569	66
34. North Carolina	1,565	1,471	94
35. North Dakota	148	121	82
36. Ohio	1,199	931	78
37. Oklahoma	635	282	44
38. Oregon	326	290	89
39. Pennsylvania	5,118	2,786	54
40. Rhode Island	205	111	54
41. South Carolina	2,612	2,420	93
42. South Dakota	180	86	48
43. Tennessee	836	762	91
44. Texas	3,178	2,510	79
45. Utah	942	240	25
46. Vermont	272	248	91
47. Virginia	757	497	66
48. Washington	419	198	47
49. West Virginia	180	145	81
50. Wisconsin	333	281	84
51. Wyoming	118	102	86

* Taken from Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics 1976, Draft Version, Table 16

** Total includes territories.

EXHIBIT 2.12

NUMBER OF SECTION 309 PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE STATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976*

STATE	Special Projects	Teacher Training	TOTAL
TOTALS**	251	224	475
1. Alabama	4	4	8
2. Alaska	0	0	0
3. Arizona	2	3	5
4. Arkansas	2	7	9
5. California	4	5	9
6. Colorado	0	0	0
7. Connecticut	2	1	3
8. Delaware	0	0	0
9. District of Columbia	2	1	3
10. Florida	9	14	23
11. Georgia	10	2	12
12. Hawaii	1	3	4
13. Idaho	0	1	1
14. Illinois	7	7	14
15. Indiana	15	26	41
16. Iowa	6	8	14
17. Kansas	7	6	13
18. Kentucky	1	2	3
19. Louisiana	12	1	13
20. Maine	3	2	5
21. Maryland	8	1	9
22. Massachusetts	4	3	7
23. Michigan	5	4	9
24. Minnesota	5	6	11
25. Mississippi	9	7	16
26. Missouri	2	8	10
27. Montana	2	1	3
28. Nebraska	3	12	15
29. Nevada	2	1	3
30. New Hampshire	3	1	4
31. New Jersey	6	0	6
32. New Mexico	6	4	10
33. New York	2	0	2
34. North Carolina	0	0	0
35. North Dakota	9	4	13
36. Ohio	9	40	49
37. Oklahoma	14	3	17
38. Oregon	11	4	15
39. Pennsylvania	18	6	24
40. Rhode Island	1	2	3
41. South Carolina	4	0	4
42. South Dakota	5	2	7
43. Tennessee	6	3	9
44. Texas	6	5	11
45. Utah	4	1	5
46. Vermont	1	1	2
47. Virginia	6	5	11
48. Washington	5	2	7
49. West Virginia	2	1	3
50. Wisconsin	0	0	0
51. Wyoming	0	0	0

* Taken from Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics 1976, Draft Version, Table 29

** Total includes territories

EXHIBIT 2.13

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED THROUGH SECTION 306(a)(4) AND 309 GRANTS*

STATES	Number of Projects	TARGET AUDIENCE						Type of Project	
		Teachers	New Teachers	Future Teachers	Aides	Volunteers	Administrat.	306	309
1. Alabama	3	X				X			X
2. Alaska		No information available							
3. Arizona	2	X					X		X
4. Arkansas	5	X			X		X		X
5. California	9	X					X		X
6. Colorado	1	X							X
7. Connecticut	4	X				X			X
8. Delaware		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
9. District of Columbia	1	X					X		X
10. Florida	10	X					X		X
11. Georgia		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
12. Hawaii	2	X					X		X
13. Idaho	1	X					X		X
14. Illinois	10	X		X			X	X	X
15. Indiana	2	X							X
16. Iowa	5	X							X
17. Kansas		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
18. Kentucky		No information available.							
19. Louisiana	3	X		X		X		?	?
20. Maine	2	X				X			X
21. Maryland	2	X							X
22. Massachusetts	3	X							X
23. Michigan	3	X					X	X	X
24. Minnesota	6	X			X		X		X
25. Mississippi	2		X						
26. Missouri	1	X							
27. Montana		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
28. Nebraska	4	X							
29. Nevada		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
30. New Hampshire	2	X				X			X
31. New Jersey	5	X					X		X
32. New Mexico	1	X					X		X
33. New York		No information available.							
34. North Carolina	5	X				X	X		X
35. North Dakota	1	X							X
36. Ohio		No information available.							
37. Oklahoma	15	X		X					X
38. Oregon	5	X		X					X
39. Pennsylvania	4	X					X		X
40. Rhode Island		No information available.							
41. South Carolina		No information available.							
42. South Dakota	1	X					X		X
43. Tennessee	1	X							X
44. Texas	11	X					X		X
45. Utah	1	X							X
46. Vermont	1	X					X	?	?
47. Virginia	4	X							X
48. Washington		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
49. West Virginia		No staff development projects provided during 1977-78.							
50. Wisconsin	1	X							X
51. Wyoming	1	X							X

with 23. Twenty-two states listed five or fewer projects, with six of those listing none. No teacher training projects were reported in nine states.

The most current data on the 306 and 309 special projects funded through the Act are available through the ADELL Clearinghouse's Catalog of Adult Education, FY1978. Exhibit 2.13 summarizes the number of staff development projects and their target audiences funded as special projects and reported in the ADELL catalog. In preparing the catalog, each state director of adult education was contacted but data were not provided by all. Although relatively little information is given about many of the projects, it is the most inclusive list available.

D. Number and Type of Local Projects

Most funds from the Adult Education Act are distributed by the states to support instructional projects at the local level. As part of the reporting system associated with Section 437 of the General Education Provisions Act, USOE annually collects information from the states on each of their adult education grants. Exhibit 2.14 on the following page gives the number of grants by state and type of recipient agency for FY1977 (three states did not report). Of the states reporting, the largest number of grants (133) was awarded by New York. Next were Ohio (118), California, and Alabama (each 117).

Exhibit 2.15, below, provides the number and percent of grants awarded to each of seven types of agencies. As shown, local education agencies (LEAs) dominated with over 77% of the grants. Combined, the LEAs and universities (primarily community colleges) accounted for 89.3%. Included in the "other" category are Community Action Agencies, private non-profit organizations, and community-based groups.

EXHIBIT 2.15

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GRANTS BY AGENCY TYPES: FY1977

	No. of Grants	Percent of Total
Local Education Agencies	1,848	76.9
Institutions	43	1.8
Interjurisdictional Admin. Agen.	117	4.9
State Agencies	41	1.7
Universities	297	12.4
Public Libraries	-	-
Other	56	2.3
TOTAL	2,402	100.0

EXHIBIT 2.14

NUMBER OF GRANTS BY STATE AND TYPE OF AGENCY: FY1977

	TYPE OF AGENCY*							
	LEA	INST.	IAA	SA	UNIV.	PL	OTHER	TOTAL
1. Alabama	97	6	1	1	12			117
2. Alaska	1	1			6		3	11
3. Arizona	23	1		1	3		1	29
4. Arkansas	50		11	2	4			67
5. California	96		2	2	14		4	118
6. Colorado	---------- NO REPORT ----------							
7. Connecticut	22		2				2	26
8. Delaware	9			1				10
9. District of Columbia	1							1
10. Florida	56			1	10		2	69
11. Georgia	80		1	1	1			83
12. Hawaii	7			1				8
13. Idaho	4		1	1	8			14
14. Illinois	41	1	2	2	32			78
15. Indiana	---------- NO REPORT ----------							
16. Iowa		2		1	17			20
17. Kansas	17	1			19			37
18. Kentucky	91			2	7			100
19. Louisiana	66	2		1	4		1	74
20. Maine	22	2	3	2	2		3	34
21. Maryland	24			1	2		1	28
22. Massachusetts	27	1	1	1	2		6	38
23. Michigan	91		1	1	1			94
24. Minnesota	59		2		2			63
25. Mississippi	47				10			57
26. Missouri	47		1	1	6			55
27. Montana	13			2	3			18
28. Nebraska	12	1		1	11		1	26
29. Nevada	2			1	5			8
30. New Hampshire	27							27
31. New Jersey	73	7		2	12		1	95
32. New Mexico	8	2	2	1	3		1	17
33. New York	85		24		16		8	133
34. North Carolina	---------- NO REPORT ----------							
35. North Dakota	18	2			3		1	24
36. Ohio	110		2	2	3		1	118
37. Oklahoma	39				3			42
38. Oregon	1		1	1	15		1	19
39. Pennsylvania	64		27	1	10		6	108
40. Rhode Island	11	1		1	2		3	18
41. South Carolina	75	1	9	2			1	88
42. South Dakota	23	4	1	1	1		4	34
43. Tennessee	83	2			3			88
44. Texas	29		7		11			47
45. Utah	31							31
46. Vermont	16			1	1			18
47. Virginia	92	4	1		2		2	101
48. Washington	5				25		3	33
49. West Virginia	46							46
50. Wisconsin	1		15	1	2			19
51. Wyoming	6	2		1	4			13
TOTALS	1,848	43	117	41	297	--	56	12,407

* Based on data provided to USOE in Section 437 Reports, 1978.

LEA - Local Education Agencies
INST - Institutions
IAA - Inter. Adm. Agencies
SA - State Agencies
UNIV - Universities, etc.
PL - Public Libraries
OTHER - Other
TOTAL - Program Total or Average

Exhibit 2.16 on page 40 provides a summary of the size of grants made by the states to the seven categories of agencies. As shown, overall the average size of project grants during FY1977 was $30,256, but about 28% of the grants were for less than $5,000. Indeed, 10.2% of the projects overall and 12.4% of the LEA projects received grants of $2000 or less.

In addition to reporting grant amounts and types of grant recipients, in completing the "437 Reports" the states are to report previous year expenditures for each project in terms of 12 funding categories. These data appear to be considerably less complete and precisely reported than the more aggregated data on current grants. Nevertheless, the available information does suggest the relative priorities among activities in many states and also is illustrative of the quality of the available information on the within-state project level.

Exhibit 2.17, page 41, summarizes the available information on how each state spent its FY1976 allotment and shows the percentages of monies reported as expended on each of the following 12 categories: State Administration, Special Projects - Section 306; Teacher Training - Section 306; Research - Section 306; Programs of Instruction - grades 1-8; Programs of Instruction - grades 9-12; State Advisory Council; Special Projects - Section 309; Teacher Training - Section 309; Institutionalized Persons - grades 1-8; Institutionalized Persons - grades 9-12; and Unallocated. As shown, three states did not report. Four states spent more than 55% of their monies on Programs of Instruction for grades 1-8 and grades 9-12 (categories E and F on the Exhibit). California reported it spent 83.7% of its monies on Special Projects Section 306 (category B). Delaware spent 51.1% on this category. However, the remaining states spent 3.2% or less on special 306 projects. Two states, Alabama and Washington, recorded amounts spent for State Advisory Councils, totalling only .1 and .5 percent, respectively. Four states reported all of their monies as Unallocated (category X), so nothing could be learned about their priorities. It can be seen that emphasis on expenditures vary considerably by state.

E. Instructional Locations and Participants

Although approximately 77% of the local adult education programs are administered by LEAs, only about 44%[1] of the participants receive their instruction in elementary or secondary school locations. The Annual Performance Reports contain information on the number of participants by type of location and Exhibit 2.18 summarizes the

---

1/Data from Annual Performance Reports for the period July 1, 1976 through June 30, 1977; data from the state of Washington were missing; data from the 49 states and District of Columbia indicated 43.9% of the participants in elementary or secondary school locations.

EXHIBIT 2.16

SUMMARY OF SIZE OF ADULT EDUCATION PROJECT MADE BY STATES BY TYPE OF RECIPIENT AGENCY: FY1977*

Type of Agency	Total Grants for FY1977	Mean Grant Amount	Grants of $5,000 or Less		Grants of $100,000 or More	
			N	%	N	%
Local Education Agencies	$48,611,267	$26,304	634	34.3%	79	4.3%
Institutions	$ 831,300	$19,333	3	7.0%	1	2.3%
Interjurisdictional Administrative Agencies	$ 5,807,942	$49,640	20	17.1%	15	12.8%
State Agencies	$ 3,053,621	$74,479	2	4.9%	10	24.4%
Universities	$12,591,292	$42,395	18	6.1%	19	6.4%
Public Libraries	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	$ 1,780,655	$31,797	3	5.4%	1	1.8%
TOTAL	$72,676,077	$30,256	680	28.3%	124	5.2%

*As reported to USOE as part of requirements of Section 437 of the General Education Provisions Act; three states (Colorado, Indiana, and North Carolina) did not report.

Note: See Exhibit 2.15 for the number of grants awarded by agency by agency type.

EXHIBIT 2.17

EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL ADULT EDUCATION FUNDS BY EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES LISTED IN THE REPORTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO SECTION 437 OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT: FY1976

		PERCENT OF FUNDING BY CATEGORIES OF EXPENDITURES*												TOTAL $
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	X	
1.	Alabama	3.9				66.9	8.0	.1	13.7	2.4	4.4	.5	.1	1,358,328
2.	Alaska	1.7				43.4	16.3		15.4	21.5			1.7	142,948
3.	Arizona	1.7				84.4			2.7	10.0	1.1			556,163
4.	Arkansas	13.3				64.1	4.5			8.7	6.3	1.9	1.2	827,612
5.	California		83.7						15.4				.9	4,934,800
** 6.	Colorado	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
7.	Connecticut												100.0	1,160,990
8.	Delaware	1.2	51.1										47.7	274,483
9.	District of Columbia					51.0	34.0		3.2	11.8				374,932
10.	Florida					83.4			7.2	9.4				1,542,607
11.	Georgia	6.8		2.2		60.5	30.4							1,311,594
12.	Hawaii	8.6				74.7			4.6	10.1	2.0			318,947
13.	Idaho		3.2			47.9	14.8		4.1	16.2	4.8	.6	8.4	383,446
14.	Illinois	3.4				72.3	11.4		4.9	5.5	.4	.4	1.8	3,696,700
** 15.	Indiana	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
16.	Iowa	3.5		2.8		58.2	13.8		6.7	14.9				1,106,131
17.	Kansas	23.6		1.5					7.8	5.6	46.0	10.9	4.6	858,376
18.	Kentucky					85.1			3.0	9.5	2.5			1,546,378
19.	Louisiana					81.4			18.6					1,410,126
20.	Maine					74.8			17.5	7.7				455,739
21.	Maryland	2.6				72.6			11.9			1.3	11.6	1,547,217
22.	Massachusetts	4.1				56.9	13.9		9.1	6.5	7.7	1.9		1,655,656
23.	Michigan					88.8			11.2					2,625,758
24.	Minnesota	5.5				74.8			3.3	6.1	10.0		.3	1,412,025
25.	Mississippi					70.8	11.6		14.4	3.1				817,595
26.	Missouri					73.9	12.4		8.2	5.5				2,067,667
27.	Montana					55.8	17.5		4.3	7.8	6.1		8.3	356,226
28.	Nebraska	6.3	1.2	4.6	.7	64.6	9.0		5.0	7.7	.8			498,776
29.	Nevada					75.1			20.8	4.1				209,889
30.	New Hampshire					76.6	10.9		5.9	6.5				325,276
31.	New Jersey	2.8		7.3		73.8	1.0		11.7		3.4			2,681,905
32.	New Mexico					57.7	14.4		9.3	7.7	8.7	2.2		371,747
33.	New York												100.0	7,791,805
** 34.	North Carolina	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
35.	North Dakota	9.6	.8	.5		51.4	10.6		13.8	4.5	8.0	.9		366,057
36.	Ohio	4.1				68.3	12.1		4.9	7.7	2.6	.2		3,165,124
37.	Oklahoma					75.1				7.2			17.7	862,441
38.	Oregon					67.7				13.6	.4			619,474
39.	Pennsylvania	2.8				61.8	3.4		14.4	4.9	11.6	1.0		2,415,602
40.	Rhode Island	5.6		.4		44.7	33.6		1.7	7.0	4.3	2.8		505,001
41.	South Carolina								16.8		82.6		.7	936,812
42.	South Dakota												100.0	370,324
43.	Tennessee	4.1				77.7	8.7		4.3	5.1			.1	1,178,963
44.	Texas												100.0	2,650,408
45.	Utah					66.7			10.5				22.8	322,467
46.	Vermont					65.4	14.2		9.0	10.3	.9	.2		271,088
47.	Virginia					79.0	1.7		14.4	1.3	3.2	.4		1,426,819
48.	Washington		.5	.1		84.1		.5	2.6	10.4	1.7			986,078
49.	West Virginia	3.5		1.9			82.0		2.4	10.2				994,098
50.	Wisconsin	3.2				67.8	10.1		7.3	6.2	4.3	1.0		1,352,857
51.	Wyoming	10.1				69.9			11.2	1.7	7.1			259,202

**Data not available

*Key - CATEGORIES OF EXPENDITURES

(A) State Administration (B) Spec.Projects Sec 306 (C) Teacher Trng.Sec 306
(D) Research (E) Prgms.of Instr., Grades 1-8 (F) Prgms.of Instr., Grades 1-12
(G) State Advisory Councils (H) Spec.Projects Sec 309 (I) Teacher Trng.Sec 309
(J) Instl.Persons, Grades 1-8 (K) Instl.Persons, Grades 1-12 (X) Allocated
TOTAL

EXHIBIT 2.18

PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL LOCATION BY STATE: FY1976

	Elementary and Secondary School	Community College and 4-year Colleges	State and Local Institutions	Learning Centers	Other (Homes, Worksites, etc.)
1. Alabama	43	10	10	25	12
2. Alaska	21	11	1	56	11
3. Arizona	37	0	9	50	4
4. Arkansas	24	8	16	36	16
5. California	45	9	2	21	23
6. Colorado	19	18	11	24	28
7. Connecticut	46	2	8	30	14
8. Delaware	49	0	17	28	6
9. District of Columbia	55	0	0	30	15
10. Florida	76	9	6	6	3
11. Georgia	19	6	25	31	19
12. Hawaii	41	0	2	24	33
13. Idaho	14	30	7	36	13
14. Illinois	29	13	8	9	41
15. Indiana	35	4	14	34	13
16. Iowa	15	16	13	34	22
17. Kansas	48	8	10	28	6
18. Kentucky	28	3	4	45	20
19. Louisiana	53	3	3	35	6
20. Maine	21	5	16	24	34
21. Maryland	61	2	5	7	25
22. Massachusetts	14	4	8	73	1
23. Michigan	53	2	6	20	19
24. Minnesota	42	12	10	2	34
25. Mississippi	63	12	2	10	13
26. Missouri	40	7	8	26	19
27. Montana	22	14	5	52	7
28. Nebraska	33	33	9	14	11
29. Nevada	15	26	6	36	17
30. New Hampshire	45	1	3	17	34
31. New Jersey	41	2	8	42	7
32. New Mexico	19	23	7	51	0
33. New York	68	2	5	21	4
34. North Carolina	16	43	9	23	9
35. North Dakota	49	9	14	22	6
36. Ohio	32	4	7	44	13
37. Oklahoma	55	6	9	20	10
38. Oregon	13	54	2	29	2
39. Pennsylvania	50	0	25	22	3
40. Rhode Island	34	3	13	30	20
41. South Carolina	37	33	8	4	18
42. South Dakota	23	19	12	43	3
43. Tennessee	40	12	11	21	16
44. Texas	35	7	13	30	15
45. Utah	51	17	3	27	2
46. Vermont	10	0	3	23	64
47. Virginia	39	6	9	35	11
48. Washington	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
49. West Virginia	39	1	11	44	5
50. Wisconsin	4	42	3	29	22
51. Wyoming	14	23	7	33	23

* Data from Annual Performance Reports, 7-1-76 to 6-30-77

** Report not available at time of writing

reported data for FY1976. As shown, in only ten of the states reporting were as many as 50% of the participants receiving instruction in elementary or secondary schools and in only two states were two-thirds or more of the participants. Conversely, 21 states reported a third or less of their participants received instruction in elementary or secondary schools.

Learning centers are the second most frequently used type of location for adult education instruction. Thirty of the states reported 25% or more of their participants received instruction in a learning center. Although the characteristics of such centers vary, they are frequently in former public school buildings, and generally offer a more flexible program than is possible in small, scattered settings. In a center, the staff is usually full-time and can thus interact more with each other and with participants and there are more professional staff to rely on for advice and expertise. On the other hand, because of its location, transportation problems may make learning center programs inaccessible to some groups, and because of their size, they may be more threatening to potential participants than smaller, more scattered settings**.

Community colleges, four-year colleges and vocational technical institutes are used extensively by some states but not at all by others. Five states reported that over a third of their participants received their instruction in these kinds of settings while six reported no students at all there.

Reflecting the federal legislation, the states generally report some but not a great many participants receiving services in state or local institutions. Included in this category of locations are prisons and other correctional facilities, hospitals, and institutions for the handicapped. As shown in Exhibit 2.18, 17 states reported over ten percent of their participants were in such institutions, while none reported over 25% of their participants were institutionalized.

Overall, in FY1976 the states reported that 14.3% of their participants received their instruction in some location other than a school, learning center, college, or institution. These "other" locations included private homes, worksites, etc. Predominant in this category are private homes. Individualized, home-based instruction accounts for most of the participants in Vermont, and for a significant minority in Maine and New Hampshire. Overall, six of the states reported one-third or more of their participants were in some "other" location and 33 reported ten percent or more.

** Groteleoschen, A.D., Gooler, D.D. and Knox, A.B. Evaluation in Adult Basic Education: How and Why. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1976.

It is presumed that significant use of such "other" facilities will increase access of those most in need of program services to adult education programs. It is further assumed, therefore, that changes in the types of locations used for the program will affect the characteristics of program participants. Data from the Annual Performance Reports on the characteristics of the participants for FY1976 show that almost 70% of the participants were under 35 years old, that there were slightly more women than men, and that 56.6% were members of minority groups. In addition, the available data indicate that the participants were about evenly distributed across the beginning (grades 1-4), intermediate (grades 5-8) and advanced (grades 9-12) instructional levels, that over three-quarters of the participants were in programs located in urban areas, that 49% were employed and 51% unemployed. Exhibits 2.19 through 2.22 below summarize the available participant data which appear reasonably complete[1/].

EXHIBIT 2.19

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS IN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM: FY1976*

A G E	NUMBER	PERCENT
16 - 24	687,654	41.6
25 - 34	451,029	27.3
35 - 44	254.889	15.4
45 - 54	139,782	8.5
55 - 64	67,277	4.1
65 or more	50,463	3.1
T O T A L	1,651,094	100.0

*Taken from NCES, Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics, Draft 1976.

1/ At least 33% data in the NCES Draft Adult Education Program Statistics Report for July 1, 1975-June 30, 1976 (op.cit.; Tables 13 and 14) for urban-rural, local employment status and several other participant variables of possible interest were missing and are not shown here.

EXHIBIT 2.20

RACE OF PARTICIPANTS IN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY1976*

	NUMBER	PERCENT
American Indians	17,277	1.1
Negroes/Blacks	394,440	23.9
Asian Americans	137,178	8.3
Spanish Surnamed Persons	360,223	21.8
Indochinese	24,595	1.5
Other Individuals	717,381	43.4
T O T A L	1,651,094	100.0

*Taken from NCES, Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics, Draft 1976.

EXHIBIT 2.21

SEX OF PARTICIPANTS IN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY1976*

	NUMBER	PERCENT
Male	740,283	44.8
Female	910,811	55.2
TOTAL	1,651,094	100.0

*Taken from NCES, Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics, Draft 1976.

EXHIBIT 2.22

LEVEL OF ENROLLMENT BY PARTICIPANTS IN ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY1976*

LEVEL OF ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	PERCENT
Beginning Level (Grades 1-4)	542,878	31.6
Intermediate Level (Grades 5-8)	570,300	33.2
Advanced Level (Grades 9-12)	603,405	35.2
T O T A L	1,716,583**	100.0

* Taken from NCES, Adult Education - Adult Basic and Secondary Level Program Statistics, Draft 1976.

**Total differs from total in other tables because of duplicated count.

F. Summary and Conclusion

Information on the operations of the adult education program available from USOE and other national sources provide a general overview of the adult education program. Federal program funds are granted to State Education Agencies on the basis of a legislative formula and in response to submission to USOE and their approval of a state plan. In all states at least ten percent of the program funds are from non-federal sources, and in 20 states over half of the program funds are non-federal.

Most federal funds are distributed by the states to support instructional projects at the local level. Across the states in FY1977, 77% of the grants from the states were made to local school districts, 12% were made to community colleges and universities, and the other 11% were made to a wide variety of governmental and non-governmental organizations. Although over three-quarters of the local grantees were school districts, only about 44% of the participants received their instruction in elementary and secondary school locations. Separate adult learning centers are frequently used, as are community colleges, technical institutes, churches, neighborhood centers and private homes.

Finally, while considerable program data are available, they are not of uniform quality. Some data are not available for all states, some are of doubtful validity, and there are some inconsistencies across some of the sources[1/]. In addition, there are relatively little available below the state level. As a consequence, while it is possible to obtain what appears to be a reasonably clear overview of the program, many questions remain unanswered and the need for more detailed information for program planning and monitoring should be clear.

[1/] e.g., fiscal data reported to USOE and to the National Advisory Council.

CHAPTER 3

SELECTED ISSUES IN ADULT EDUCATION

Dealing with attacking the problem of undereducated adults requires contending with several critical issues, many of which have been of concern since the inception of national adult education program. Broadly, these issues can be conceived as falling into the categories of public policy, program administration, finance, participation, and instruction. At the policy level, there are current concerns with the relationship of adult basic and secondary education programs to the concepts of lifelong learning, employability training, and life coping skills. Programmatically, major current issues include the implementation of participatory planning processes, appropriate sponsorship of local programs, and the nature of appropriate evaluation and reporting systems. Critical fiscal issues include the appropriateness of federal requirements for the maintenance of effort at the state level, the calculation of appropriate costs per instructional unit (e.g., per hour, per student, per teacher, etc.), and the more general problem of assigning costs or sources of support to specific program activities when many services are provided in-kind, or when there are many sources of financial support for the same activity (e.g., teachers' salaries, equipment, etc.). Major issues of participation include the definitions of eligible and special populations, trends in participant characteristics, and program outreach and retention. Issues of instruction include those associated with teacher preparation and certification, and with instructional content and design.

While each of these issues is important, discussion in this chapter will be limited to those dealing with participation and instruction. These are of great concern to USOE and are fundamental to Development Associates' descriptive assessment of the federal adult education program, and to the design of a future impact evaluation. The other issues cited above will be addressed in subsequent, separate products of this study.*

A. Issues of Participants and Participation

Program participation has been a central concern to adult education policy makers and administrators since the federal adult education program began. Issues and assumptions regarding participants and participation are behind many of the 1978 legislative changes. Since the inception of the federal program, and again in 1978, the definitions of eligible and special populations were debated and modified. Also in 1978, specific legislative provisions were promulgated to address issues of programmatic outreach to

---

*E.g., case studies of the state-plan development process in seven selected states are currently being completed and, to the extent data permit, the final study will address the other issue areas.

participants and the retention of participants in the instructional program.

1. Target Population Definitions

The Adult Education Program target population as defined by current legislation covers all individuals over the age of 16 who lack sufficient educational skills to function effectively in society and who are not currently required to be in school (Sect. 302 of P.L. 95-561). Figures on the scope of the target population vary according to the criterion used and a great deal of attention has been focused in recent years on determining the nature and extent of the adult education target population.

In 1977, the general designation included 52 million adults, 15 million below the eighth grade level and another 37 million without high school diplomas[1]/.* This figure was based on criteria outlined in previous legislation which included only those who had not completed high school. The 1978 changes in the law will presumably increase the percentage of the population falling into the target category.

Another assessment of the population is based on the APL study of functional competency which found that one-fifth of all adults lack the skills and knowledge needed to function competently in society and an additional one-third perform with only marginal success[2]/. Still another criterion accepted by the Office of Education is a measure of functional literacy using the National Assessment of Educational Progress reading test. OE reports that one in eight 17 year-olds fail this test[3]/. In this regard, it is important to note that variance in assessments of target population size is dependent on differences in criteria employed. One result of this lack of consensus on criteria is that reliable data on the extent of the adult illiteracy problem in the U.S. are unavailable.

The operational definition of the target population in adult education, then, is a crucial issue, one which has not yet been resolved and which has repercussions on all areas of program development. Although the criteria used in specifying the target population are not universally applied, assessments of federal programs admit that only one to two percent of the target group is being reached by adult education programs designed to increase competencies[4]/. At the same time, the target population data are used as a formula base for funding distributions to the states from the federal government.

*Footnotes are at the end of the chapter.

The problem of definition and assessment of the extent of the target population in adult education led the National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE) to introduce the concept of "demand population," which they defined as "those adults 16 years of age and older experiencing personal and social disadvantage due to inadequate basic education who actually want, demand and are capable of using adult education[5]." According to the NACAE, the assessment of the demand population is more manageable and would be a more equitable basis for funding allocations[6]. They do admit, however, that there is a need for more accurate information on both the demand and target populations and ask the U.S. census to provide a better reporting system.

Two contradictory trends seem to be developing in relation to the target population. First, the legislation reflects an expansion of the original intent of upgrading the education of those Americans who had not completed elementary school or high school. With the 1978 legislation, adult education is open to anyone who wishes to secure training that will enable him or her to become more employable, productive and responsible, without restricting the opportunity to those who have not completed high school. Second, the notion of the demand population would seem to narrow the field to those who want and demand educational services, possibly to the detriment of the "hard core" of the educationally disadvantaged. The implications of this possibility, if it is indeed a trend, are profound.

If the demand population becomes the basis of funding, what happends to the hard core? Related to this, Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox found that those who tend to participate in ABE programs share an important characteristic -- "their essentially middle-class outlook. This is not surprising since those who attend are a self-selected group determined to 'better' themselves through education[7]." Furthermore, a 1969 Census Bureau study showed that 85% of all participants in all kinds of adult education had successfully completed high school or a higher level of education. It also showed that the more schooling an adult had completed, the more likely he or she would be to pursue some kind of further education[8]. While on the one hand, the demand concept could refine the scope of the target population by eliminating those who really do not need formal school certification, it could also operationalize a system of educational triage and divert efforts away from the untouched inner core of the target population.

2. Special Populations and Needs

The legislation has been sensitive, however, to those segments of the total eligible population considered most in need of assistance. These include adults with limited English language

skills, adults who live in rural areas or in urban areas with high unemployment, institutionalized adults, the elderly and handicapped, culturally deprived or members of racial/ethnic minorities. Lack of data on the location and specific needs of these groups is a problem recognized by state and federal agencies[9]. The 1978 amendments to the Adult Education Act require states to "identify the needs of the population of the state for services authorized under this title" (306 b(4)). The term need itself has been defined both as a lack of functional competency, and as a clarification of problems encountered by adults who wish to finish high school and have been unable to do so[10]. These two operational definitions are posed by Turman in a report prepared for USOE. She states that the legislative requirement for an assessment relates to the special populations cited in the legislation and was mandated in response to criticisms of the states for giving inadequate attention to the populations for which the Act was intended[11].

Though special emphasis on specific adult populations has been part of the Act and its legislative history, implementation has not always been adequate[12]. In a study on Adult Secondary Education programs, Muraskin and Fischer report that "as a whole, programs are dependent upon serving any student who enrolls and attends[13]." They go on to note that programs serve educationally disadvantaged in only the broadest sense -- those without a high school diploma -- and that within that category no particular target groups are identified as the primary group for whom the program is intended[14]. The Mezirow study confirmed this pattern. "In a very real sense," the authors say, "ABE programs are 'creaming operations'. The least literate and most alienated tend to be excluded[15]." The needs assessment requirement of the 1978 legislation -- whose compliance is linked to funding -- is meant to correct this situation. However, careful attention should still be focused on this matter since the federal guidelines have always required inclusion of local target population definitions in state plans[16].

3. Participation Trends

Even if the target population (and its subgroups) is accurately identified at the state level and provision made to meet their special needs, better statistical information about participation roles are needed for evaluation and further planning purposes. Participation rates in relation to the total target population are very low (one to two percent)*. Some researchers

*But it is important to recall that since there is no consensus on a conceptually sound definition of target population, there is no real way of knowing how much of the population is being served. Also, this estimate does not take into account the large (but unknown) number of persons who have successfully completed USOE and other funding source adult education programs, and thus, ought not to be included in the base of the target population.

have suggested a pattern of declining participation[17]. The NACAE, however, has stated that Adult Education is the fastest growing of the four major public education sectors: elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and adult[18]. OE reports an increased enrollment of almost one million between 1965 and 1977. The participation patterns reported for the AE program in FY1977 are as follows:

- 31% enrolled in ESL;
- 8% institutionalized adults;
- 56% females;
- 38% unemployed;
- 13% receiving public assistance;
- 9% received certificates of 8th grade completion;
- 11% passed the GED; and
- 7% enrolled in other educational programs, as a result of having been enrolled in ABE or ESL programs[19].

Despite the impressive statistics, there does seem to be a consensus that better accounting methods are urgently needed for both evaluation and planning. The NACAE therefore has called for improvements in the state reporting system used by USOE. They are especially concerned that the concept of "enrollment" be clarified along with an accounting of "contact hours" or program participation[20].

Also important, but not discussed in the literature, is the enrollment of members of the target population in adult education programs not funded through the Adult Education Act. CETA, Title XX and other federal funds support large numbers of adult education students, some of whom are included in USOE program statistics and some of whom are not. Similarly, states and localities as well as private organizations support large adult education programs, again with students who are to an unknown extent included and excluded from USOE participant counts.*

Related to the number of participants, is the matter of who participates. A 1976 report by Kirschner Associates indicates that there is a trend for more and more people to become literate by virtue of compulsory school laws. This results not only in a declining population needing basic literacy education but in lowering the average age of program participants. "It does appear that the supply of adult basic education programs is being concentrated on the recent dropouts and other relatively

*Based on discussions with state and local adult education program directors and reviews of available participant statistics.

young members of the target population including the poor and minorities[21]." In adult secondary education, the report continues, the participants "tend to be young, dropouts, minorities, and quite often women[22]." The Mezirow et al. study of ABE programs describes several categories of participants which roughly coincide with the Kirschner classification.

In speaking of another type of person who has left formal schooling, the high school "pushout", Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox also raise a question about the use of the adult education program as a day care center for the emotionally disturbed or retarded individual who has been eased out of school or other institutions[23]. Muraskin and Fischer also observed a tendency for ASE programs to ensure that they not make incursions into the clientele of regular secondary instruction[24]. They lamented the lack of concrete statistical data on who participates in ABE and chided the American Council on Education, who administer the GED test, for never having systematically described the characteristics -- socio-economic, demographic, geographic, or educational -- of test takers, and the NACAE for its relative lack of analysis in its 1974 report on the AE target population[25].

4. Program Outreach

Closely related to the issue of target population definition, identification and participation is the recruitment/retention problem. Regardless of the definition or the criteria used in identifying the target population, it is widely acknowledged that the discrepancy between the targeted recipients of the Adult Education Program and those actually reached is acute indeed. The term "reaching" in this context means first recruiting those adults in need of basic educational services and then retaining them in appropriate programs. The new regulations call for needs assessments, as well as more and representative planning, which along with provisions for day care and transportation needs of the program participations is indicative of the government's concern toward reaching the intended population. The draft of the new guidelines state: "The legislative history of the amended Adult Education Act recognizes the failure of the states to adequately bring the underserved, least educated and unemployed into the mainstream of our society[26]." "Intensive" outreach efforts are mandated.

A 1973 nationwide study of ABE by the Systems Development Corporation stated that while most states "provide guidelines for concentrating local ABE efforts on specific target populations at the local level... few indications were given that there were any priority categories of students who would be vigorously recruited[27]." Muraskin and Fischer confirmed this pattern, noting that "many local program administrators indicated that recruitment is not even an issue for them; there is no need for it[28]."

It would seem that where there is a conscious recruitment effort the priority of reaching ever greater numbers of the target population makes special efforts to reach specific groups seem unreasonable. Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox state that in this effort to "reach the most," the middle-class oriented ways of attracting participants are relatively effective. The result, of course, is that those most readily attracted are similar to the middle-class adults who typically participate in adult education[29]. The Systems Development Corporation report noted that the most widely used method to recruit potential enrollees was the print media -- specifically newspapers[30]. But it is the unusual functionally incompetent individual who would be attracted to a literacy program through such a strategy.

Among the recruitment methods that do work, word-of-mouth is acknowledged as the most effective in reaching the hard core individual[31]. Friends, co-workers, or other students provide the supportive conditions of confidence and trust such persons need before making a commitment to a program. Other relatively effective recruitment methods include referral by community organizations, churches, employers, welfare, and other organizations with which the target population is already associated[32].

Outreach is only one aspect of the problem, however, the other being retention. Keeping students in the adult education program involves a process of matching the program to participant needs and characteristics, giving special attention to identifying and removing the barriers to participation.

A great number of studies have focused on the characteristics of the "dropout." An early study (1969) of night school dropouts showed that the dropout was more likely to be younger, unmarried or widowed and to live alone while the greatest difference between the dropouts and the stay-ins related to whether or not they felt at home in the class[33]. Other studies showed that persistence in programs depended on the initial attitudes of the students. Hurkamp's 1960 study of student attitudes revealed a significant difference between persisters and dropouts on seven different initial attidues[34]:

- Expectation of success in the course;
- Guilt concerning absence from home;
- Interest in open-house participation;
- Degree of teacher skill;
- Previous school experiences;
- Value placed on education; and
- Expectation of course difficulty.

Later studies focusing on students have given more attention to home and job-related factors such as health, living conditions, employment, transportation and family problems[35]. Lack of transportation and need for child care are among the most frequently mentioned reasons for program withdrawal. Change of job, enrollment in job training or new employment also account in part for attrition[36].

Recently, however, the entire concept of dropout has been challenged. As adult education programs have moved toward less structured and more individualized instruction, the differences between dropping out (or early withdrawal) and program completion have become less distinct. If instruction is really designed to meet individual needs, then for many participants there will be no prescribed "course" of study and the appropriate point of termination will be individually recognized and negotiated by teacher and participant. Carried to its extreme, this argument holds that all things considered, any termination point is appropriate as long as student is satisfied. A somewhat moderated position is to substitute the notion of a "temporary withdrawal" for the concept of dropping out of the program.

One difficulty with focusing primarily on student attitudes or "dropouts' characteristics" is that such an approach can ignore the institutional side of the retention problem. A number of studies have attempted to locate failures of the programs themselves and to identify and clarify participatory barriers.

Mezirow et al. found that the quality and kind of instruction can be linked to retention rates. The prevailing effort to teach the "middle range" has resulted in heaviest dropout rates among students at the highest and lowest levels of achievements, including those who need help most desperately[37]. Besides teaching methods and techniques, they also report that the content of ABE classes is also correlated with retention rates. Those teachers who emphasized content of direct relevance to ghetto adults (consumer and health education, racial heritage and coping skills) were "more likely than others to be successful in retaining their students[38]."

5. Some Implications and Conslusions

It is clear that recent legislation has recognized the tendency for certain types of adults rather than others to participate in adult education programs. Thus, although enough people are seeking adult education to provide the programs with ample numbers of participants, self-selection may be taking precedence over true need.

The need for intensified outreach programs appears to be great. Print media remain a prime means for outreach, but it constitutes a form of circular reasoning, since the very adults intended to be served may be unable to read. More extensive use of word-of-mouth and other outreach approaches seems appropriate.

Furthermore, it appears that certain complementary features of program offerings need to be even more visibly pointed out to hard core segments of the target population. Adult Education is intended for adults, who as members of society, have certain familiar responsibilities and constraints. Day care and transportation may be real limitations on participation. The actual extent of these being barriers needs to be known so that greater consideration can be made in course scheduling and location, integration with local transportation facilities, etc. Interactions with citizens in the participatory planning process and informal discussions with community residents should help in this regard.

In designing outreach efforts, not only the number but the nature of the participants must be visibly considered. If the population eligible for the program continues to grow, and current program funding levels are maintained, some groups cannot help but be underserved. Intensified outreach programs can be expensive, and trade-offs between numbers of participants and those with what the program defines as the greatest need may be required. How to operationally define that need, of course, is not fully resolved.

On another plane, perhaps the perception of adult education per se is at issue. What place or role does adult education have for adults in need of more education? Is it primarily an avenue to achieving various education, employment or personal goals? Individuals may not have the same goals as the program, and participants may leave a program satisfied before staff believe the program's goals are achieved.

Finally, the characteristics of the person who withdraws from adult education (because for either his/her goals have been fulfilled or for other reasons) are apparently not the same as those of the person who remains with the program. Why the person leaves and what the program has "left" with that person for the future needs to be learned, so that the program can better serve the target population. There may be more "successes" than were realized if individuals have benefitted in some way from program contact.

B. Issues of Instruction

A growing body of theoretical literature exists on the adult as a learner. It is supported by increasing numbers of empirical studies on specific "adult" or mature learner characteristics. Building on the work of others, Knowles[39] outlines four basic characteristics which distinguish the adult from the child in learning orientation. First, an individual's self-concept moves from that of being a dependent personality in infancy toward that of being an independent, self-directed human being in maturity. Second, the accumulation of life experiences which adults possess becomes a learning resource, providing them with a larger and richer base for new learning. Third, readiness to learn becomes increasingly a product of the developmental tasks of the individual's social role and responsibilities and decreasingly a product of biological development. And fourth, with maturity one's time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge, as in the case of the child, to immediacy of application; that is, adults come to a learning situation because they perceive a need to improve their ability to face problems they are experiencing and seek solutions which can be applied now.

Based on research about the implications of these adult characteristics, a remarkable consensus has emerged among theorists and practitioners -- Kidd, Knowles, Knox, Houle, Maslow and Rogers, among others[40] -- on the essential components of an effective learning situation which have obvious implications for teaching. These components are as follows:

- The existence of an environment of trust, mutual respect, acceptance and shared responsibility;
- The use of educational methods which promote participation, cooperation and problem-solving;
- The use of content which arises out of the learner's interests, priorities and articulated needs; and, finally,
- Teachers who firmly believe in the intelligence and capacities of the learners, teachers who seem themselves as co-learners, working with people as facilitators, discussion leaders and resource persons on issues of joint interest.

According to Knowles, optimum learning occurs in a climate of trust, confidence, and self-respect where adults can "assess their own needs, formulate their own goals, share responsibility in designing and carrying out learning experiences, and evaluating their own programs[41]." Yet, a survey of ABE and ESL programs by

Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox (Center for Adult Education, Columbia University, 1975) revealed in most classrooms the widespread use of the elementary school tradition of assignment, drills, dictation, etc., and a conspicuous absence of student involvement in the development and implementation of learning projects. "It should be noted that involving students in any kind of evaluation of methods, materials, teacher performance, scheduling, classroom facilities or anything else for that matter, is almost unheard of in ABE[42]."

While this dissonance between accepted theory and practice may have several causes, lack of adequate teacher preparation and experience has been recognized as a major one. According to the Columbia University study (Mezirow et al.), nearly 80% of ABE teachers were part-time and two-thirds of them taught full-time in the public schools. Most had been in the program less than two years and barely a third had more than three years' experience teaching ABE[43]. Some regional and state surveys reveal similar patterns. The 1977 New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment reports that 78% of all programs surveyed employed no full-time teachers[44]. While the study covers more than the federal Grants to States programs, it is reflective of the employment patterns in Adult Education. A longitudinal study of ABE programs in the State of Virginia revealed that only 20% of the teachers considered adult education their primary occupation[45].

The situation becomes more dramatic when coupled with information on teacher preparation in the area of adult learning. In Virginia, for example, 66% of the teachers have had no graduate instruction in adult education and 83.4% have had less than three semester hours[46]. In New York, 76.7% of the teachers had no college credit in adult education, 57.6% had no preservice training and 61.7% had no inservice training[47]. It should be noted that the Office of Education recognized this problem early and introduced the concept of regionalization of staff development in 1969[48]. However, although monies available for special projects through Section 309 of the Adult Education Act were available to regions to implement this effort in staff development, a 1975 report[49] reveals widespread dissatisfaction with teacher preparation.

1. Specialized Needs of Adults and Teacher Preparation

Ever since the problem of undereducated adults became a national concern the process of addressing this problem through specific programs has revealed a serious lack of available and adequately prepared teachers[50]. Additionally, as the concept of the target population for these programs was refined over time, it was no longer merely designated as a generalized "undereducated" adult population. The target group today is defined in terms of both cultural and educational criteria. Therefore, not only do teachers need to be competent in subject matter and basic adult education principles and processes, but they also need

competence in dealing with an undereducated adult who also is a member of a specific cultural group.

Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox maintain that in no other area of public education is there greater need to professionlize instruction by making it relevant to the needs of a specialized population[51]. This "specialized" population is, as already mentioned, primarily adult, that is, a population which has a learning orientation different from that of children. But beyond this, the ABE and ESL populations are further characterized by membership in culturally different groupings. Groups within the target population defined by the 1978 legislation (urban unemployed, rural handicapped, etc.) each carry with them specific problems and concerns with which ABE and ESL teachers need assistance addressing in the classroom context. First, there are skills required in recognizing the cultural factors which define the reality of special groups including the aged, handicapped and the poor -- as well as ethnic minorities, i.e., the black, the Hispanic, etc.[52] Second, and beyond mere recognition skills, are the more crucial skills of communication and interaction with members of another culture or subgroup. Without these skills, even the best prepared teacher in instructional techniques may not be able to effectively encourage learning among the program participants.

Finally, the participants in ABE and ESL programs -- besides being adults and members of specific cultural groupings -- have another common characteristic about which teachers need to develop specific competencies. They are all educationally disadvantaged. That is, they are lacking in formal schooling and their "inability to speak, read or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability." (Adult Education Act, Section 303). The syndrome of failure and lack of self-confidence which many of these students have experienced throughout their lives demands special skills on the part of teachers if learning is to be facilitated[53]. Research has demonstrated the role teachers and teacher expectations can have on an individual's behavior and self-perception. Without sensitivity to such dynamics, in classrooms where strong cultural and class differences between teachers and students already exist, the potential for inhibiting knowledge and skill development in program participants definitely increases.

Reports from individual programs confirm the importance of adequate teacher preparation and selection. In Rhode Island, for example, a program for English as a Second Language was very successful, report the evaluators, largely because of the criteria for teacher selection[54]. This program was "...not a program of highly paid, master's level teachers...hired for their academic qualifications..." Rather, the teachers selected for this program were carefully screened through interviews to meet the following criteria:

- they like their students;
- they like the program; and
- they are willing to contribute time and effort to achieve success of the program.

This project achieved a lower rate of early withdrawal than regular programs had in the area. Of those students who withdrew, nearly half had stayed for over three months in the program. Such results could certainly be due to program factors other than teacher selection criteria, but conversely, choosing teachers who are in harmony with students' needs seems particularly important in an ESL program where the need for dealing with cultural issues is the rule rather than the exception.

Reinforcing this conclusion are the results of a third party evaluation performed on adult basic education programs in the state of Washington[55]. Some of the major conclusions also are centered around issues of staff selection or training. Two of the conclusions from this report are:

- "The most effective aspect of curriculum was the attitude and skill of the instructor[56]; and
- "Greater value was placed on the instructors' commitment to students than particular preparation for a given subject area[57]."

The following "commendation" by the Washington evaluation team sums up the usefulness and necessity of other-than-academic considerations in teacher selection.

> "Instructors in the Adult Basic Education program were intensely aware of the many problems confronting the adult student as he attempts the formal learning process. The instructors go beyond classroom instruction and concern themselves with the real-life problems of their students[58]."

According to several regional and state surveys, most supervisors and teachers at least recognize the need for training in the theory and practice of facilitating adult learning. In the State of Virginia, for example, teachers perceived several competency areas constituting the greatest need for inservice training. These were: principles of learning as they apply to adults; the characteristics of the adult learner; selecting and evaluating instructional materials; teaching techniques and methods appropriate for ABE learners; and assessing the learning problems of ABE learners[59].

Although efforts at promoting more and better preservice and inservice training has increased over the years, not all teachers are required to avail themselves of these opportunities and many do not. While recognizing the need for training, teachers generally will not participate in inservice programs unless paid or given released time for this purpose. Budgetary considerations clearly limit the amount of training a state can provide on this basis[60].

2. Teacher Certification

Related to the issue of teacher preparation are arguments regarding the benefits and importance of teacher certification. It would seem that most ESL and ABE teachers lack formal preparation for the task of facilitating the learning of other adults in public education programs[61]. However, the relationship between teacher training and student performance is ambiguous and forms a part of the discussion around teacher certification. A 1976 report by Griffith and Markus states that literature on teacher training produced inconclusive results, showing:

> "negative effects on student achievement with increased amounts of training in some cases; superior student performance with untrained teachers in others; and no relationship whatsoever between teaching styles employed by teachers and the learning performance of their students[62]."

Although several attempts have been made to specify the competencies of an adult teacher, Spear notes that none of the efforts to specify performance standards for teachers of adult basic education using the task analysis approach have been effective[63]. While no one denies the need for preparation, there is little agreement on what constitutes adequate preparation[64]. Until this issue is resolved, the problem of certification cannot be completely overcome.

Also, as is apparent from the earlier discussion on the importance of such factors as teacher commitment, at least some of the elements which constitute a good instructor are not readily amenable to becoming part of the certification procedures. Indeed, this fact partially accounts for the results of a 1976 survey on certification in which Griffith reports that the majority of states saw no need for special certification for teachers employed to teach adults. Only ten states reported that they issued a special credential to adult education teachers, and these were typically no more than a special endorsement on a regular certificate[65].

Griffith and Markus conclude: "The case for certification of adult education teachers still lacks general acceptance[66]." Institution of certification requirements, in their view, will involve the resolution of four major issues:

- The validity of the methods for distinguishing competence and incompetence;
- The degree of specificity required in certifying competence;
- The duration of the period for which competency is certified; and
- The locus of the power to screen applicants for certification.

3. Competency-Based Instructional Design

While teacher preparation and certification are critical issues in adult education, so too are those centering around instructional design. Over the last ten years, the Competency-Based Education (CBE) movement, considered by many a revolutionary change in U.S. education[67], has gained ground among adult educators. The result has been a redesign of many adult education programs. Although the CBE movement began at the secondary level, its rapid acceptance in the area of adult education is related to the nature of adult programs. Since adults have already acquired practical experience which may enable them to demonstrate attainment of specific competencies, a competency-based adult education (CBAE) program offers them the possibility of eliminating unnecessary formal coursework while receiving credit for already acquired competencies.

The role of the government in promoting this movement has also been considerable. Belief in government responsibility for providing special help to educationally deficient adults has undergirded all federal legislation on adult education since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964. Through the years, federal involvement in adult education went hand-in-hand with a focus on program results. Government adult education responsibility came to be seen as providing its target population with educational opportunities for achieving economic independence, greater employability and success at meeting adult responsibilities[68]. The focus on functionality which always characterized the intent of the federal legislation, together with the development of the CBE movement at other levels of the educational establishment, added impetus to CBAE development. In 1977, the National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE) recommended to Congress that "grade level reference should be

eliminated" from the Federal Adult Education Act "and the purpose reflect a competency-based program geared to individual needs[69]." Thereby adding the influence and prestige of the NACAE to the movement.

In 1978, a National Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education was convened in Louisana with the purpose of considering several critical issues of CBAE and developing responses to them[70]. One of the issues considered was the development of a functional definition of Competency-Based Adult Education. As a result of the workshop, the following definition was formulated:

> "Competency-Based Adult Education (CBAE) is a performance-based process leading to demonstrated mastery of basic and life skills necessary for the individual to function proficiently in society[71]."

James Dorland, Executive Director of the National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education, in an address to another invitational workshop on CBAE in Austin, Texas expanded this definition to include the notion of CBAE as a total system of performance-oriented educational processes which provide adults the opportunity to become successful in carrying out their life role activities, at the same time continuing to de-emphasize the accumulating and demonstrating of knowledge[72].

With CBAE, emphasis on program design and measurement shifts from merely knowing to doing, that is, from demonstrating possession of knowledge to ability to perform specific behaviors associated with that knowledge[73]. Grade level-based design, or the traditional youth education model in adult education, stresses the acquisition of basic literacy skills as the ideal preparation for personal and vocational success[74]. In contrast, CBAE stresses the practical application of specific skills associated with success. The curriculum development process in CBAE, for example, would lead to programs "better directed to the needs of the adult rather than having them based on elementary school curricula[75]."

According to Joan Keller Fischer, in a review of CBAE for the US Office of Education, "if we accept competence as meaning the possession of required knowledge, skills and abilities, then CBE differs from past education in assumptions and approaches rather than goals[76]." According to Fischer and others, the key assumptions behind CBAE are[77]:

- that competencies associated with successful adult life can be identified;

- that instruction can be designed to effectively increase these competencies; and
- that identified competencies can be measured.

The implications of these assumptions for CBAE program development are:

- First, and most obvious, the need is to identify precisely the knowledge and behaviors (competencies) related to successful performance as an adult[78]. The focus is to be on outcomes rather than capacities and the attainment of skills becomes the goal, not the means to the goal[79].
- Second, the need to recognize that instructional strategies, materials and program content are closely tied to and determined by the specific learning objectives which are considered a means to an end (of developing a competency) rather than an end in themselves[80].
- Third, the use of criterion-referenced evaluation techniques in assessing the extent to which the identified competencies have been attained and are explicit, known and agreed upon by both teacher and student.

The building block of a successful competency-based adult program is the adequate identification of necessary competencies. In an attempt to define them, the USOE contracted the Texas Education Agency and the University of Texas at Austin to conduct a study for the purpose of specifying those competencies which are functional to economic and educational success in today's society, and to develop devices for assessing those competencies of the adult population in the U.S.[81]. The five-year Texas study is known as the Adult Performance Level (APL) Survey.

The APL project first redefined the concept of functional literacy in terms of the integration of reading, writing, problem solving and computation skills in the areas of occupational knowledge, consumer economics, government and law, health and community resources[82]. Second, the APL project developed performance indicators based on the identification of these functional competencies. Third, it administered these instruments to a representative sample of U.S. adults and produced some new and shocking estimates of literacy rates in the U.S., indicating that only 46.3% of the population is proficient in the areas defined as requirements for functional literacy[83]. Of greater concern, a full 19.1% were categorized as "functionally incompetent[84]."

The APL study provided both the impetus for a phenomenal development and interest in CBAE and the basis for criticism. In 1978, it was reported that at least 43 states were carrying out 153 separate CBAE programs[85]. In fact, B. Lyle, the APL Project Director, states that the APL study has provided "a systematic statement of objectives of ABE, thereby helping to establish it as a separate, identificable education system[86]." In 1978, USOE sponsored a national conference of state directors to promote new programs and discuss critical issues in relation to the APL study[87]. Increasingly, the literature reflects a clarification of the issues around CBE and the APL study provides the framework for this discussion. One set of criticisms focuses on the philosophical underpinnings of the CBE approach itself while another set focuses on the misapplication of the concept.

The first group of critics questions the validity of the APL findings and inferences drawn from them. The most outspoken of them is William S. Griffith of the University of British Columbia who attacks the soundness of the APL approach and the value issues involved in the study. Griffith asserts that the APL test developers "committed a logical error in defining the universe of behavior (objectives) which an adult should be able to perform to be classified as functionally competent. There is no one set of basic requirements for adult living which can be discovered by any known research technique." He argues that the APL methodology invalidated the study, since its claim that success on APL measures can be positively correlated with success in the real world was not and cannot be demonstrated by either empirical or theoretical validation[88]. His sharpest criticism lies in his assertion that the study and the instruments are culturally and value-biased. "The APL approach exemplifies a philosophy of adjustment to the status quo rather than an active inquiring attitude compatible with the notion of responsible citizenship in a free society[89]." The APL measures of competency were associated with different levels of adult "success" as measured by income, education and job status. Those who are successful according to these criteria usually accept the dominant values of the culture. Measurement of other notions of success based on other values and different skills or knowledge are not included in the APL tests.

Cernero also challenges the APL approach. In 1977, both the APL Survey and the General Educational Development (GED) tests were administered to 269 GED candidates who had not been instructed according to the CBE method. The correlation between the two tests was .89 indicating a high degree of association[90]. The author concludes that the results effectively "destroy the myth that 'coping skills', as measured by the APL Survey and 'academic skills' as measured by the GED test are unrelated[91]." He goes on to challenge the APL instructional approach which emphasizes specific competencies, affirming that generalizability

of the academic skills of reading, writing and computation better equip the adult to function in a changing world than do coping skills which focus on a specific set of problems. The best "coping" skills relate to the worlds of both today and tomorrow[92].

A final significant criticism of those who challenge the APL approach in adult education relates to the role of the government in the dissemination of the concept. Griffith, for example, points to the advocacy role the USOE has played from the beginning of the project, noting that the RFP for the study stated that the results would "constitute the objectives of a system of adult education" and "that subsequent adult syllabuses and curricula would be based on the APL[93]." The criticism resides in a judgment about the impropriety of a government agency promoting and making a commitment to a given approach even before it was tested.

A second group of critics are concerned about the proper implementation of the APL system. Dorland notes that the confusion over the terminology surrounding CBE tends to obscure a critical examination of the substantive issues of the movement itself[94].

This is related to the challenge of Spady of the National Institute of Education who laments that what has come to be understood as CBE is "nothing more than a testing and remediation program focused on basic literacy and mathematical skills[95]." He argues for the need to understand the meaning and importance of "competency-life-role" activities, how to base a program on these competencies and how education extends beyond student certification alone. The conferences and workshops sponsored by state and federal government agencies, as well as professional associations such as AEA and NAPCAE, are a partial response to the felt need to inform educators at the program level of the meaning of CBAE and provide a forum for discussion of issues surrounding it. However, an uninformed "bandwagon" approach to CBE could be potentially damaging to the potential of CBAE[96].

4. Some Implications and Conclusions

It would seem there exists a continuing need to recognize that the nature of the learning climate, the match of instructional methods with learner characteristics, the presence of relevant and individualized content, and the "broker" role of committed teachers are critical factors in adult education. A sensitivity to the role of being a teacher and its concomittant learner-teacher dynamics may, in some ways and for certain types of learners, play more of a role than didactic and substantive competencies per se. Such factors could be the facilitators of retention in the instructional setting, thus causing student and program objectives to be accomplished. If so, this has implications for teacher selection and training. Inservice

training, which may "have been on the back burner" in some local settings, may become the vehicle for sensitizing faculty and providing important interpersonal skills.

Thus, the notion of what is being implemented, the nature of the instructional setting, and the role the teacher plays in facilitating learning should not be overlooked. The teacher's role may be the critical link between a program's goals/objectives on the one hand and program outcomes/benefits on the other. Teacher certification, therefore, is a critical issue and needs to be examined from a variety of perspectives as a thrust which may or may not enhance program effectiveness. Definitional and procedural problems in implementing the certification concept may be present for some time, and it is widely acknowledged that not all facets of the teacher role are amenable to becoming part of the certification process.

The nature of competency-based instructional design is also an unresolved issue of importance in adult education programs. Since certain programs and teachers already orient their material in terms of life-oriented or coping-skill examples, the real differences between the latter and APL format approaches need to be examined closely. The concept of orienting curricula to functional competencies and specific learning objectives also may be a difficult one in view of cultural and value-biased considerations. How feasible a relatively standardized approach is and how far apart from current curricula designs needs further assessment. Wider consideration could be made of what competencies are associated with successful adult life, taking into account diverse learner subpopulations and varieties of goals.

C. Summary and Conclusions

There are several critical and long-standing issues associated with participation and instruction in adult education programs. Major issues surrounding program participants center around the problem of establishing common operational definitions of the program's target groups, the problem of inadequate data about needs and extent of participation, and the problems of program outreach, barriers to participation and reasons for early withdrawal. These issues have been present in the literature of adult education since the beginning of the federal program and are reflected in several of the critical legislative changes in the program in 1978.

The issues of participation relate closely to the issues of instructional method and design. From assessments that have been made in various parts of the country, both teachers and administrators feel a need for more training. Because of the special characteristics of the participants in ABE, ESL and other program components, there appears a particular need for teacher training in the areas of adult learning principles and processes along with training in intercultural understanding and communication.

While the need for more and enhanced teacher preparation is clear from the literature, the need for certification of teachers is not. ABE teachers generally are not required to have preservice training in the area of adult education nor to be specially certified as adult educators. In part, this is because of the lack of clarity and consensus regarding the most important teacher characteristics.

Educator differences regarding the operational definitions of the target populations, and the critical characteristics of effective teachers also are related to differences regarding the most appropriate instructional design. In her Congressional testimony, Assistant Secretary for Education Mary Berry accused the adult education program of "the use of teaching methods which are adequate for young children but are offensive to adults and work poorly[97]." A competency-based instructional design emphasizing the performance of skills needed by adults for coping in modern society is seen by many as, at least, a partial response to this charge. Others, however, are concerned that the competency-based approach from the University of Texas APL Study which is advocated by USOE is neither the answer to adult learning needs nor necessarily even a fundamental change in the program.

Recently emerged and clearly on the horizon is an overarching emphasis on individualized instruction which is seen as a more comprehensive response to the criticisms of the program and to the heterogeneous needs and characteristics of the adult population. Building on reported programmatic successes in Vermont and elsewhere, federal program officials are currently urging state and local program staff to seriously consider a redefinition of instructional designs and the role of the adult educator. Adult Educators are being called on to experiment with methods to assist students articulate their educational needs, plan specially tailored instructional content and approaches, and monitor and evaluate their progress. The objective seems to be to accommodate both traditional and APL-CBE instructional content and styles -- while providing a more "learner-centered" instructional design[98].

Chapter 3: Footnotes

1. Education Division, D.HEW. "Renewal Evaluation Report: Adult Education Act, 1977, mimeo. p.23.

2. Buel R. Lyle. Final Report: The Adult Performance Level Study. Austin, University of Texas, 1977. p.41.

3. "Renewal Evaluation Report." op.cit. p.23.

4. Comptroller General of the United States. The Adult Basic Education Program: Progress in Reducing Literacy and Improvements Needed. Report to Congress, Washington, Comptroller General, June, 1975, quoted in Griffith, 1977.

   National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Adult Education Futures and Amendments, Survey of State Support, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1977.

   Final Report: The Adult Performance Level Study. op. cit.

5. National Advisory Council on Adult Education. An Assessment of the Federal Adult Education Act Program. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1978.

6. Ibid. p.8.

7. Mezirow, G., Darkenwald, A., Knox. Last Gamble on Education. Washington, D.C., Adult Education Association of the USA, 1975. p.50.

8. T.H. Bell. "Our Schools and Lifelong Learning," paper prepared for the annual QUEST Consortium of the American Federation of Teachers, Chicago, April, 1975.

9. Carlene Turman. Adult Education Needs Assessment. A report prepared for the Office of Education, Division of Adult Education, NCES, 1978. (mimeo). p.1.

10. Ibid. p.8.

11. Ibid. p.1.

12. Office of Education, DHEW. Draft Regulations for Adult-Education State-Administered Program, Feb. 1979, mimeo. pp.16 & 19.

13. Lana Muraskin and Joan K. Fischer. Adult Secondary Education: The State of the Art in GED Preparation and Credit Programs. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University, 1976. (mimeo).

14. Ibid.

15. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.55.

16. Adult Secondary Education: The State of the Art in GED Preparation and Credit Programs. op. cit.

17. M. O'Keefe. The Adult, Education and Public Policy. Paper prepared for the program in Education for a Changing Society of the Aspin Institute for Humanistic Studies, Aspen, Colordo, December, 1976.

18. An Assessment of the Federal Adult Education Act Program (NACAE). op. cit. p.17.

19. "Renewal Evaluation Report." op. cit. pp.27-28.

20. Ibid. p.12.

21. Kirschner Associates, Inc. Summary Report: An Analysis of Selected Issues in Adult Education. Prepared for Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, Office of Education, DHEW, 1976, (mimeo). p.4.

22. Ibid. p.6.

23. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.45.

24. Adult Secondary Education: The State of the Art in GED Preparation and Credit Programs. op. cit.

25. Ibid.

26. Draft Regulations for Adult Education State Administered Programs. op. cit. p.17.

27. Systems Development Corporation. A Longitudianl Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program. Nov. 1973, pp.2-20.

28. Adult Secondary Education: The State of the Art in GED Preparation and Credit Programs. op. cit.

29. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.144.

30. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program. op. cit. pp.2-71.

31. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.47.

32. Ibid. p.47.

33. M. Alam and E.N. Wright. A Study of Night School Drop-Outs. A Schedule 10 Project. Toronto Board of Education Research Department. Toronto, Ontario. March, 1968.

34. Rosemary Hurkamp, Differences in Some Initial Attitudes of Students Who Complete and Students Who Drop Out in the Wellesley, Massachusetts Adult Education Program. Final Report. School of Education, Boston University. Boston, Massachusetts. January, 1968.

35. Rosemary Meyer, Survey of ABE Adult Basic Education. Dropouts at the Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. Education Center. Kankakee, Illinois, November, 1974.

National Advisory Council on Adult Education. A Target Population in Adult Education. Washington Government Printing Office, 1974.

University of State of New York, New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment. Albany. University of State of New York, Division of Continuing Education. Jan. 1977.

Last Gamble on Education. op. cit.

36. New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment. op. cit; A Target Population in Adult Education (NACAE) op. cit.

37. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.28.

38. Ibid. p.68.

39. Malcolm S. Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species, Gulf Publishing Company, Houston, 1973. pp.45-49.

40. Cyril O. Houle. The Design of Education. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass, 1972.

J.R. Kidd, How Adults Learn, New York; Association Press, 1973.

Alan B. Knox, Adult Development and Learning, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Abraham Maslow. Motivation and Personality. New York. Harper and Row, 1970.

Karl Rogers. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston. Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

A. Tough. The Adult's Learning Projects, Toronto. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.

41. Malcolm S. Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education, New York: Association Press, 1970. p.51.

42. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.28.

43. Ibid. p.58.

44. New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment, Report No. 1. op. cit. p. 224.

45. Richmond School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University, A Longitudinal Study of Adult Basic Education in Virginia 1970-1978. p.106.

46. Ibid. p.104.

47. New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment, Report No. 1. op. cit. pp.246-247.

48. J.A. Bosco, An Evaluation of Regionalization in Staff Development in Adult Basic Education, Center for Resource Development in Adult Education, University of Missouri, 1975. p.viii.

49. Ibid. p.26.

50. Ibid. p.viii.

51. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.156.

52. Sylvia Sherwood. "Sociological Aspects of Learning and Memory." Gerantologist, March, 1967, 7, 19-23. p.87.

53. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.38.

54. Schaffan, J.A. and Boulmetis, J. Project ERA/COPE: FY1974 Final Report. Curriculum Research and Development Center of the University of Rhode Island. pp.46-48.

55. Crawford-Baird-Smith Corp. An Evaluation of Adult Basic Education in the State of Washington: Abstract. 1973.

56. Ibid. p.3.

57. Ibid. p.4.

58. Ibid. p.5.

59. Marilyn B. Shaw, and Harold W. Stubblefield, (eds.) Adult Basic Education Research Development and Dissemination. College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1978. p.142.

60. Last Gamble on Education. op. cit. p.110.

61. William S. Griffith and Edward E. Marcus, "Accreditation, Certification and Licensing for Adult Education Teachers: An Examination of Facts, Opinions and Options, State Board of Education, Illinois Office of Education, 1977.

A Longitudinal Study of Adult Basic Education in Virginia: 1970-1978. op. cit.; New York State Continuing Education Needs Assessment op. cit.

62. Ibid. p.37.

63. George E. Spear, ed., Adult Education Staff Development: Selected Issues, Alternatives and Implications, Kansas City: Center for Resource Development in Adult Education, University of Missouri, 1976. Quoted in Griffith and Marcus. op. cit.

64. Accreditation, Certification and Licensing for Adult Education Teachers. op. cit. p.42.

65. Ibid. pp.6&7.

66. Ibid. p.42.

67. James R. Dorland. A National Focus on Competency-Based Adult Education. NAPCAE, 1969. p.13.

68. Ibid. p.8.

69. Adult Education Futures and Amendments Survey of State Support. op. cit. p.6.

70. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. HEW, Office of Education. Government Printing Office, 1978. p.1.

71. Ibid. p.1.

72. "A National Focus on Competency-Based Education." op. cit. p.4.

73. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. op. cit. p.7.

74. A National Focus on Competency-Based Education. op. cit. p.12.

75. Adult Functional Competency: Final Report. op. cit. p.3.

76. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop on Adult Competency Education. op. cit. p.7.

77. James E. Hurtling. "Competency-Based Education: Is It Applicable to Adult Education Programs?" Adult Leadership, June, 1974, pp.50-52.

78. Ibid. p.8.

79. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop ... op. cit. p.8.

80. Ibid. p.8.

81. Adult Functional Competency: Final Report. op. cit. p.1.

82. James T. Parker. "Adult Performance Level." HEW, Office of Education. Memo. March, 1978. p.1.

83. Adult Functional Competency: Final Report. op. cit. p.41.

84. Ibid. p.17.

85. Ronald Gross, and Samuel C. Brightman. "A Focus on Responsibility: Adult Education Confront America's Future" Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, No. 5, Jan. 1979. pp.17-28.

86. Adult Functional Competency: Final Report. op. cit. p.3.

87. Report of the USOE Invitational Workshop..." op. cit. P.33.

88. William S. Griffith, and Ronald M. Cervero. "The Adult Performance Level Program: A Serious and Deleberate Examination." Adult Education. Vol. XXVII, No. 4, 1977-209-224. p.221.

89. Ibid. p.218.

90. Ronald Cervero. "The Relationship Between the GED Testing Program and Competency-Based Education." Adult Literacy and Basic Education. Vol. 2, No. 4, Winter, 1979, pp.234-240.

91. Ibid. p.237.

92. Ibid. p.239.

93. Division of Adult and Continuing Education, The Texas Education Agency, and the Division of Extension, The University of Texas at Austin. A Research and Development Project to Design a System and Supporting Materials to Provide an Adult Performance Level (APL) in Four Major Sub-Areas for Adult Basic Education. Preliminary Report prepared for the Adult Performance Level Study Director's Advisory Conference. November 2-3, 1972. Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1972 quoted in Griffith. op. cit. p.7.

94. A National Focus on Competency-Based Adult Education. op. cit. p.11.

95. A Focus on Responsibility: Adult Educators Confront America's Future. op. cit. p.22.

96. Ibid. p.22.

97. Mary Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education. Statement before Sub-committee of Education Arts and Humanities Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate. October 4, 1977. p.18.

98. Paul Delker. Director Division of Adult Education, USOE. Presentation to a Meeting of State Directors of Adult Education on "Future Issues in Adult Education." Alexandria, Virginia. May 22, 1979.